

The new Secretary of State

Dean Acheson will be confirmed in his new post by the Senate. There is no doubt of that. He will be subjected to a "scanning." The Senate wants to know just what his views are on our policy toward Russia. Why does the question arise? For two reasons. First, when Mr. Acheson was Assistant Secretary of State (1944-46) a number of people were hired by the Department who were later questioned for dubious loyalty. Of these, 134 were finally dismissed. Mr. Acheson, presumably, had some responsibility in hiring them. Second, last August Adolf A. Berle Jr., himself a former Assistant Secretary, testified that when he pushed for a firm postwar policy toward Russia in 1944, Mr. Acheson opposed it and had as his chief assistant Alger Hiss, who is now under indictment for perjury in connection with the spy trials. It is unfortunate that these questions arise. But they ought not cause deep uneasiness. Whatever were Mr. Acheson's attitudes in 1944, by 1947 at the latest he was firm in opposition to the Soviets. In May of that year he first proposed what was to become a month later the Marshall Plan. His public utterances have since been strong and even eloquent in condemning Russian policies and tactics. If his earlier policy really was one of "appeasement," it must be remembered that often enough those who tried to do business with Russia and found it impossible are the very ones who become Moscow's sternest opponents. We need a strong foe of communism as Secretary of State, and we need him for longer than the sixteen months that have been the average tenure of the three preceding Secretaries. We hope that the new Secretary will evolve a more adequate foreign policy, especially in the Far East, and that he will get support for it from the White House.

Budget for fiscal 1950

For the fourth time since the end of the war President Truman sent a budget message to Congress, and for the fourth time his estimate of government spending broke peacetime records. For the fiscal year 1950, which begins July 1, 1949, he asked the Congress to approve a budget totaling \$41.858 billion. At the same time he referred to several prospective international undertakings, among them the North Atlantic defense pact, which were still too indefinite to be estimated for budgetary purposes. For these needs he would request appropriations later on. Much as the average taxpayer may regret such huge Federal expenditures, he can still recognize their necessity. This is not a peacetime budget. It is a preparedness or a "cold war" budget, as can be seen by a casual inspection of the various items. The President wants \$14.3 billion for defense and \$6.7 billion for various foreign-aid programs. These expenditures add up to slightly more than fifty per cent of the total budget. A large part

of the remainder is mainly an heritage of World War II. Under this heading come \$5.5 billion for veterans' benefits and \$5.45 billion to pay the interest on the national debt. In one way or another, war accounts for \$31.95 billion, or seventy-five per cent, of total spending proposed. At current tax rates, Mr. Truman foresees a deficit of \$900 million. To provide for contingencies and to make some dent in the national debt, the President asked Congress for \$4 billion in new taxes. The facts of international life being what they are today, it is very probable that Mr. Truman will get every penny of the billions for which he has asked.

Steel shortage?

In all President Truman's 3,500-word State of the Union message nothing has provoked so much comment as his brief reference to "materials in critically short supply, such as steel," and his threat to do something about it if the industry refused to expand. The reaction from steel executives was strong and instantaneous. They argued that there is no long-term deficiency in steel-making capacity and that the President's proposal for possible government-financed or government-owned capacity was a mortal blow at our system of private enterprise. Since this controversy will be with us for some time, a few fundamental observations, which will help to clarify and sharpen the issues, are in order. First of all, there is no dispute about certain basic facts. Everyone agrees 1) that the present capacity of the industry is 96 million tons annually; 2) that this is 14½ million tons above 1940 and will be increased to 98 million tons by 1950; 3) that before the war the twenty-year average of steel consumption was 43 million tons; 4) that since the war, demand has considerably exceeded supply and led to the creation of a "gray market." In the second place no one knows for sure whether the imbalance between supply and demand can be corrected, even with near-capacity production, during the next twelve months. In the third place, the source of the controversy between the Government and the steel industry lies in conflicting concepts of the American economy. The steel industry thinks in terms of past experience—of the boom-bust cycle and the feast-and-famine career of corporations. The Government reasons in the light of the Full Employment Act of 1946 and how much steel capacity is needed to fill the requirements of an expanding, high-production economy. (The need as estimated by government economists varies, but is always in excess of 100,000,000 tons.) The industry is primarily motivated by a normal concern for solvency and profits; the Government by its special consideration for the general welfare. The industry's wage earners, represented by the United Steel Workers of America, agree with the Government. The public has not yet made up its mind.

Advice to CIO Commies

It was Nikolai Lenin himself who ordered his followers to "agree to any sacrifices and even if need be to resort to all sorts of stratagems, artifices, illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges, only so as to get into the trade unions, to remain in them and to carry on communist work within them at all costs." Though no real Communist would dare question the theoretical soundness of this command, some of the boys, hitherto entrenched in the CIO, appear in practice to be backsliding. Or maybe they're only confused over ways and means of doing what the master told them to do. What ought a loyal Stalinist to do when a trade union forces him to choose between two ways of committing organizational suicide? That is precisely the grim alternative which the CIO has offered to the Farm Equipment Workers, and may soon offer to the Office and Professional Workers. Two weeks ago FE indicated the course it proposed to follow. Instead of turning over its 40,000 members to the United Auto Workers, as the CIO ordered, the union's executive board voted to commit suicide the hard way. It decided to defy the CIO and fight for its life as an independent. This decision will force the CIO executive board, at its January 26 meeting in Washington, to lift FE's charter and give its jurisdiction to UAW. Against such competition FE's days are numbered. The Office Workers seem to be readying similar strategy. Last week they staged a national conference in Manhattan and barred the CIO regional representative from the proceedings. Now it would be somewhat impolite to offer advice to our domestic Communists, since they know their Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism from A to Z. But they have made mistakes in the past and, we remember, have had to be admonished from abroad. Before they break definitely with the CIO, someone at Manhattan headquarters on Twelfth Street ought to reread once more what Lenin had to say on this point. Else the comrades are liable, like poor Earl Browder, to become guilty of deviationism. Imagine how embarrassing that would be.

Less of Mr. Rankin

The "reform" of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives (AM. 12/11/48, p. 254; 1/15, p. 389) is hitting its stride. It all goes to show what can be done when you get a majority on the Ways and Means Committee who face up to their responsibilities. Rep. John E. Rankin of Mississippi has long been a thorn in the side of progressives. He takes a blatant stand for white supremacy. He supported Governor Thurmond's Dixie-

crat revolt. Now his brethren have found a way to give him the "treatment." Since he stands highest in seniority on the Democratic side of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, he is eyeing the chairmanship with no little satisfaction. A chairman has authority, prestige, extra clerical help and some patronage. But Mr. Rankin also loves to throw his weight about in the Un-American Activities Committee, on which he has been very vociferous. When Congress adopted the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the House limited its members to service on one standing committee. It made the Un-American Activities Committee a standing committee. But it also made an exception to the rule by allowing men to serve on any one of four particular standing committees, in addition to serving on one other. The Un-American Activities was made one of the four, so Mr. Rankin, under the present rule, could chairmen Veterans' Affairs and still cut a colorful figure on the squad investigating subversives. The new Ways and Means team has come up with a strategy to stick him in one corner. They will propose—and the Democratic caucus is almost certain to adopt—a new rule whereby no *chairman* of a House committee may serve on any other, not even on the four excepted from the 1946 rule. This will displace Mr. Rankin from Un-American Activities. The rule will be adopted precisely to solve the Rankin problem—which it will do in pretty slick fashion.

Better DP legislation

There may be nothing "coincidental," as an Administration spokesman averred, in the fact that Senator Matthew M. Neely of West Virginia, who unseated Chapman Revercomb, was chosen to co-sponsor the Administration's new Displaced Persons bill. But many people around the country, whose efforts to secure a just and generous DP law were brought to naught by the niggardliness of Revercomb, must be enjoying the non-coincidence. Among them, we wager, is Governor Thomas E. Dewey. Abroad, His Holiness Pope Pius XII must be comforted by another proof of America's deep desire to succor the homeless and hopeless of Europe, as far as lies in her power. In his Christmas Allocution the Holy Father had asked: "Instead of sending foodstuffs, at enormous expense, to refugee groups, crowded into the best places available, why not facilitate the emigration and immigration of families, directing them to countries where they will find more readily the food they need?" The McGrath-Neely bill hoists the number of admissibles from 205,000 for two years, to 400,000 over a period of four years. The DP's who would enter under this bill would not be charged against the quotas allotted any country under our immigration laws. Some question may be raised about the additional screening provisions designed to exclude "those who had a hand in persecuting other men for race, religion or national origin." This may appear to some as too general, giving too much discretion to officials in the field. Further specification might be desirable to prevent fresh "persecution" by screening authorities. The present bill reduces the preference the Revercomb bill showed for Balts (half of

AMERICA—A Catholic Review of the Week—Edited and published by the following Jesuit Fathers of the United States:

Editor-in-Chief: ROBERT C. HARTNETT

Managing Editor: CHARLES KEENAN

Literary Editor: HAROLD C. GARDINER

Associate Editors: JOHN LAFARGE, BENJAMIN L. MASSE,

EDWARD DUFF, EDWARD A. CONWAY

Contributing Editors: WILFRID PARSONS, ROBERT A. GRAHAM,

ALLAN P. FARRELL

Editorial Office: 329 W. 108TH STREET, NEW YORK 25, N. Y.

Business Office: 70 EAST 45TH STREET, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Business Manager and Treasurer: JOSEPH CARROLL

whom are Catholic), but that is all any Catholic might criticize. By successfully resisting the pressure of the extremists, Senator McGrath has devised an improved bill which seems assured of early passage by the 81st Congress.

Background of the Mindszenty arrest

Moscow issued orders to the Hungarian communist bosses several months ago to "liquidate" Cardinal Mindszenty before the last day of 1948. (Cf. "How to jail a Cardinal," p. 431 this issue.) These orders were a good deal more explicit than the muttered exclamation of King Henry II which led to the martyrdom of St. Thomas à Becket. They were so explicit and so summary that they achieved what might have seemed the impossible. They actually "embarrassed" Rakosi and his fellow-gangsters, who set up a commission to devise ways and means of carrying out Moscow's directive without causing too much of a stir, either in the "people's democracies" or in unqualified democracies, such as ours. Three courses were considered: forcible exile, assassination, or arrest. The third was chosen, not because of any scruples about the others, but because it was the least difficult to carry out by December 31 as a satellite's New Year gift to the Kremlin. It would have been more convenient to destroy the Cardinal on the invidious issue of opposition to "agrarian reform." Ruth Karpf in the *Nation* (Jan. 8) supports that line. Peasants, she tells American readers, have been known to faint under the flash of his eyes. In Hungary itself, too many peasants had seen the Cardinal working his mother's five-acre farm for that propaganda to go down.

Reactions to the arrest

The reaction through the world to the Cardinal's arrest was revulsion. People everywhere recognize the real and only issue: the totalitarian opposition to religion, unto death. The Senate of the State of New York unanimously adopted a resolution, introduced by Senator Feinberg, condemning Hungary's action. Eleanor Roosevelt in her column of January 5 observed: "Today in countries taken over by the Communists in Europe it would look as though the firmest resistance was being waged by the priests and laymen of the Roman Catholic faith." The National Lutheran Council found that the arrest "is consistent with the policy of the Hungarian Government, which seeks to dominate and control every area of church life in that country." The English *Yorkshire Post*, uncelebrated for any sympathy with Catholicism, declared that the Cardinal's "singlehanded struggle will be an inspiration to all who recognize in Marxist materialism a deadly threat to Christian civilization." No such threat is apparent to the *Christian Century* (1/12/48), Protestant non-denominational weekly, which petulantly finds the public reaction to be the product of a publicity "apparatus"—"if we may venture to use in this connection a term popularized by Whittaker Chambers." To spell out the *Christian Century's* meaning, recall that Mr. Chambers' "apparatus" was a subversive, anti-American, undercover spy ring. The editorial in the *Century* blandly

accepts the unconfirmed "confession" of the Cardinal issued by the communist regime and writes the whole incident off as a skirmish in the battle between Catholicism and communism, in which the *Christian Century* is presumably neutral. The Episcopal weekly, *The Living Church*, did not hesitate to use the word "martyr" and called for

prayers for the good people of Hungary and of the other countries in the Soviet orbit, prayers for Russia, prayers for those who are persecuted in the name of Christ. And pray even more for those who are willing for the sake of supposed peace to render to the Red Caesar the things that are God's; for it is they that play the role of the betrayer, consciously or unconsciously.

The sharp contrast between the analyses of these two reviews is quite illuminating.

Indonesia at Lake Success

Moscow was brought sharply into the Lake Success discussions on Indonesia at the Security Council meeting on January 11. The U.S. representative, Dr. Philip C. Jessup, coupled his demand for speedy transfer of complete sovereignty from the Netherlands government to the United States of Indonesia with a denunciation of the Soviets. The latter, he said, do not want an independent Republic of Indonesia, but one which will take its orders from Moscow. Soviet representative Jacob A. Malik countered with the usual Soviet accusation that the United States is really seeking monopoly and exploitation. The floods of public argument on the Indonesian question so far have simply brought out the completely irreconcilable position of the spokesmen for the Dutch and the Republic on the rights and wrongs of the dispute. The Dutch feel that an important and necessary "victory" has been rapidly and fairly painlessly achieved by a skillful use of legitimate armed force. They express unstinted confidence in the future possibilities of their proposed Federation, and point with pride to what it has already accomplished. They vigorously deny the charges of faithlessness which Dr. Jessup hurled at them and deny that they wish to perpetuate colonialism. And they show skepticism about the Republic's ability to cope with the Communists within and without its own borders. The Communists are only too ready to jump in and "help" with their kiss of death. On the other hand, the Republicans express the distrustful sentiment of the vast "boiling cauldron" of peoples in Southeast Asia, whose Anglo-Saxon friends are shocked that force has been used to squelch, not a communist, but a nationalist regime, which under Premier Hatta was actively and effectively anti-communist. And Moscow rubs its hands with glee.

Postscript from Dutch Catholic opinion

In the midst of all this, it is encouraging to note how Catholic opinion in Holland is counseling moderation as opposed to the colonial-minded extremists. Said our colleague, *De Linie* of Amsterdam, on December 10: what Indonesia's Government needs most is strength, and what the Netherlands Government needs most is wisdom.

Britain's National Health Service

Specialists in the field of medical care might make quite a different evaluation from Herbert L. Matthews' report on Britain's six months' experience with its National Health Service in the *New York Times Magazine* for January 9. There is no doubt that under this system the medical, dental and nursing professions, as well as the administration of hospitals, have been very closely tied into a national program under the Labor Government. Medical supplies are included under the coverage. Over 40 million of the 43 million inhabitants of England and Wales have been registered with doctors. Under the general compulsory social-security insurance plan every insured person pays about fifteen cents a week for medical care. If this tax is paid by all 40 millions it amounts to only \$320 millions a year. The system was originally calculated to cost almost double that amount—\$612 millions, to be exact. In practice, it has cost more. The estimates for 1948-49 run close to a billion dollars. Britain's health was not in good condition before the war, and such vast expenditures may be justified. But since the country now relies heavily on U. S. aid and cannot promise to be back on its feet even by 1952, when Marshall Plan aid is scheduled to be cut off, the issue of cost is a serious one. Mr. Matthews contends that the plan is generally popular with the public, that its medical effectiveness cannot yet be judged, that "on the average, it is conceded that remuneration is fair," and that dentists are receiving higher financial rewards than the medical profession, which finds many faults and injustices in the system. Everyone admits that there are bad kinks in the way it is now operating. Britain, a poor if not near-bankrupt nation, hardly provides a model for so prosperous a people as ourselves. But phases of the British plan may give us useful information.

Voluntary hospitals in Britain

Except for hospitals conducted by religious orders, all voluntary hospitals in Great Britain have been taken over by the State. In an article in *Hospital Progress* for September, Laurence Dopson describes how hospitals are administered under the National Health Service. "The position of Catholic hospitals under the National Health Service," he writes, "is regarded as being not unsatisfactory under the circumstances." His Eminence Cardinal Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster, persuaded the Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan, to exempt them. They receive no financial assistance from the State except that the Regional Hospital Boards pay Catholic hospitals for any services they render, and "it is anticipated that the Regional Hospital Boards will send their Catholic patients, where it is possible, to Catholic hospitals." This places Catholic hospitals in somewhat the same position as Catholic elementary schools in Britain, or probably in a more disadvantageous position. For a long time Catholic elementary schools have had their running expenses paid by local authorities. They have had to scare up the money for plant expansion by private means. This, too, was "not unsatisfactory under the circumstances," but the circumstances were themselves unsatis-

factory. The great danger into which Catholic institutions are running, in the United States as well as in Great Britain, arises from these circumstances. The State is pouring into public institutions vast amounts of money for capital expenditures from which our schools and hospitals are cut off. These public funds are drawn from taxes. High taxes deplete the sources from which private agencies must get their funds. This trend, which is developing at a rapid pace, threatens the long-term existence of our institutions. Until government officials see fit to deal more justly with us, they cannot expect our unqualified support of their public welfare programs.

Rock-a-bye, baby

Baby-sitting, said the Thoughtful Observer, is fast becoming one of those things that things are as American as. Like corn on the cob, for instance, or apple-pie, or fixing those tickets that traffic cops hand out to delinquent drivers. I see by the papers, indeed, that a school for baby-sitters recently graduated its first class. Now the average American, he went on, takes a serious view of traffic violations, especially in the case of the fellow ahead who is trying to make a right turn from the inside lane. The average American's remarks on such a fellow's ancestry and probable eternal fate sometimes verge on the acrimonious. But if he himself, said the T. O., should breeze through a stop light and hear the dismal wail of a siren behind him, he feels a new attitude towards the regulations creeping over him. And even while the officer is asking him where he thinks he is going—the \$64-dollar question that no one yet has answered correctly—the average American is searching his memory for the name of somebody who knows somebody who knows the judge. New Jersey, I understand, began the New Year with a quadruplicate traffic ticket, supposed to be unfixable. I suspect that it merely multiplies the number of people to be fixed. Not so easily, said the T. O., does even a sovereign State baffle man's primal instinct to eat his cake and have it. But I find something disquieting, he continued, about this baby-sitting school. I am as broadminded as the next man, I hope, and can understand that there are valid reasons why a young couple should go out of an evening and leave the baby at home. But that they should go out in such droves as to call for the creation of a new profession, with its own professional schools—that, said the T. O., does not explain itself. How far is this, I wonder, another manifestation of the same old instinct to eat your cake and have it? I grant you, of course, that baby-sitting has enabled many deserving young people to work their way through school. But just what do they do to work their way through a baby-sitting school?

With this issue our Washington Front is again taken over by Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., formerly our editor and now Professor of Political Science at Catholic University, Washington, D.C. We welcome the return of his valued observations and take this occasion to thank Charles Lucey, Washington correspondent for Scripps-Howard, for his six months of first-class reporting.

Washington Front

As Charles Lucey said in this space two weeks ago, the President would go before Congress in his State of the Union message with a program very little changed from last year's, but before a very different audience. The event proved Mr. Lucey's forecast accurate.

There was one change, however, which did take place as the President was inaugurated, and even before. For the past two years, the Congress had the center of the stage, and the President was an inconsequential and even alighted actor of a bit part. Now the roles have been reversed. Everybody is watching the President. The constitutional balance has been restored.

Nevertheless, the Congress will bear watching. It contains 18 Senators who were not there before, and 116 new Representatives, nearly all Democrats. Moreover, it does not look as if the President is going to have the predicted trouble with the Southern Democrats on his general social program (outside of FEPC).

A crucial vote was taken as early as January 3, when the proposal was made to strip the House Rules Committee of its arbitrary power to hold up bills indefinitely, and even to modify their texts. It was realized from the first that if this were not done, the President's social program would have little chance of passing; hence a

showdown was demanded at the very beginning. Analysis of the resulting vote is interesting. The motion was passed, 275 to 142. In the majority were 225 Democrats, but also, surprisingly enough, 49 Republicans. Against the motion were 111 Republicans, and 31 Democrats, all of the latter from the South, though none from North Carolina or Florida, and only one from Virginia (Rep. Smith, of course). What is significant is that as against these 31 potential opponents of the President from the South, no fewer than 75 others from the South voted for the motion. It might also be recalled that while Thurmond polled a little over a million votes, the President polled over 3,000,000 in the South.

It has been noted recently that, contrary to tradition, the Senate has been radical and the House conservative. If we can take the above vote as an index, this relation is also likely to be reversed. The answer will lie in those great unknowns, the 111 new Democratic Representatives. Who are they? How old are they? How many veterans? How many radical farmers? Until the new *Congressional Directory* comes out, it will be hard to tell, but the consensus seems to be that they are mostly young, and very many of them veterans, that they ran on the President's platform, though without much hope of being elected, and that most of them are in politics for the first time. They are not likely to be cynical, and probably will resist being pushed around. Mr. Truman, who is a supreme realist, will no doubt find them devoted and faithful followers.

WILFRID PARSONS

Underscorings

France has separation of Church and State. The French hierarchy is now floating a loan for the reconstruction of 5,640 Catholic churches and 2,500 other religious buildings destroyed or damaged during the war; and the French Government is guaranteeing the loan. They order things differently in Kentucky. There, Circuit Judge W. B. Ardery has ruled against a State subsidy to denominational hospitals on the ground that there is a constitutional ban against aiding religious organizations. The health of the sick in these hospitals, it would seem, is no part of the "general welfare" with which the State concerns itself.

▶ "You can't beat the RAP" may some day be the motto for radio comedians. Radio Acceptance Poll is conducted by students of all creeds from 101 colleges throughout the nation. Seventy-five Catholic colleges take part in it. College students listen and judge on the single basis of "good taste and all-around family acceptability." The first poll of the current comedy season, covering Oct. 17 to Nov. 13, places the first ten as follows: Life of Riley, Jack Benny, Eddie Cantor, Fred Allen, Red Skelton, Burns and Allen, Charlie McCarthy, Bob Hope, Phil Harris, Duffy's Tavern. For scoring, 100 to 75 is Highly Acceptable, 74 to 25 is Acceptable, 24 to — 25 is Barely

Acceptable. On this basis, Life of Riley scored 78, Jack Benny 75, the others ranging from 68 to 56. Fibber McGee and Molly? They have "graduated." Their score was so uniformly excellent last year that they are not being monitored any more.

▶ The Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S.J., who on February 2 will resign the presidency of Fordham University, has been appointed Superior of the house of retreats for men, Manresa, Staten Island, N. Y.

▶ A correspondent sends us an extract from a letter he received from Archbishop Mar Ivanios, of Trivandrum, India. The Archbishop wrote (Dec. 30, 1948):

Since my return to India less than a year ago from your great country, two priests from the dissident Orthodox Church and over 1,500 people have been received into the Catholic Church in my archdiocese. Probably you know that when I made my submission to the Holy Father in 1930, there were only four others to follow me. . . . Now in my archdiocese I have over 50,000 faithful and 90 priests.

▶ Since the article "Modern merchandising vs. the family" (AM. 1/8) differed so much from the usual approach to merchandising, it is being assigned to students of advertising at Boston College of Business Administration for critical evaluation.

▶ To the list of social-action bulletins given here last week add: *The Mediator*, Catholic Labor Institute, 1433 West 9th St., Los Angeles 15, Calif.; *Christ's Blueprint for the South*, Institute of Social Order, 6363 St. Charles Ave., New Orleans 18, La.

C. K.

Editorials

One-winged foreign policy

Very soon President Truman will have to turn one way or the other in directing this nation's foreign policy. Which way will he turn?

Throughout 1948 it became increasingly clear that the State Department was flying on one wing. That wing was the vigorous Truman Doctrine of the spring of 1947 and the even more vigorous Marshall Plan. The field of operation of both programs has been limited, for all practical purposes, to Europe.

The aim and methods of our policy in Europe have been so clear they have been spectacular. We set ourselves the titanic task of restoring the underpinning of Europe's free economic and political life. At first we hoped against hope that Russia might join forces with us in this purpose. We took pains to delineate ERP as a positive effort with European reconstruction as its goal. In one sense we were perfectly honest in proclaiming that our strategy was not primarily "anti-communist." Even had there been no threat of communism, from within and from without, the economic and hence political prostration of Europe would have required our intervention.

In another sense, ERP was plainly planned as an offset to the momentum of communism propelled by Russia. This anti-Red purpose was sharply set forth by President Truman when he surprised and even shocked Congress by demanding, in March, 1947, that it immediately underwrite a program of economic and military aid to Greece and Turkey. As soon as Russia set about to sabotage the sequel to this program—the Marshall Plan—our historic intervention of necessity took on the complexion of an anti-Russian strategy. Russian opposition made it so. The higher the tension arose between American and Soviet policies in Europe, the clearer it became that we had made a relentless decision to preserve the freedom of Western Europe, even at the cost of war.

Meanwhile we let the Far East get completely out of focus. (Cf. "An Open Letter to General Marshall," AM. 1/8.) Fenced out of Western Europe by our powerful assistance there, communism is overrunning the Orient through what early American statesmen would have termed the "imbecility" of our policy in the Far East. We have tried to fly on one wing. We have up to now developed no China policy "adequate to the exigencies" of the hour.

Now that President Truman has won election to his high office through his own political support, how will he cope with this problem of a lopsided and losing foreign policy? He is under pressure from two opposing sides.

A very strange conglomeration of American citizens is discouraging the Administration from adopting as

forthright a policy in the Orient as we have followed in Western Europe. The press of the nation seems to be going out of its way to picture our position in China as hopeless (see pp. 428-9). This defeatism still lacks a great popular voice. But foreign correspondents writing from China make up by their numbers what they want in fame. The business fraternity, seldom very far-sighted in political affairs, seems to be ready to do business with Chinese Communists. Economy-minded people, in and out of government, are always on hand to flash an unbalanced budget under your nose. The State Department seems to shelter advisers who have fathered our weak-kneed Chinese policy. Fuzzy "liberals" we always have in our midst. And fellow-travelers. And outright Communists. Then there is Henry Wallace (remember him?). All these people are vocal. By their accumulated weight they seem to have produced an appalling inertia in the Administration.

On the other hand, facts are facts—and they have a way of finding spokesmen. ECA Director Paul G. Hoffman, who stammered out a very ill-advised statement in Shanghai several weeks ago (AM. 12/25/48, p. 305), came home from China recently to beat the alarm over communist aggressions: "Hitler was a baby compared to this gang." It took first-hand observation to convince Mr. Hoffman of that truth. He now realizes that economic aid alone cannot contain Soviet power.

This estimate was strongly reinforced by "Bill" Bullitt, whose long diplomatic experience wins him a respectful hearing. Mr. Bullitt was sent to China by Congress to report on the prospects of saving the pieces. On January 6 he came out with very strong recommendations. He outlined an \$800 million program of economic and military aid to the Nationalist forces. He urged that Chiang Kai-shek's armies be put under American "direction and control." He condemned those who still propose a coalition government.

We sincerely hope—and believe—that President Truman will not relent in pitting America's strength against Russia's. His vehement denial of the allegations of the Jay Franklin article in *Life* for January 10 (cf. AM. 12/18/48, p. 277) sounds reassuring. While the appointment of Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State has stirred no enthusiasm, we do not read into it a softening of policy. The Administration's loading of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with Democrats, however, has weakened our bipartisan foreign policy where it was already weakest—on China. For it was Republicans who forced the inclusion of aid to China in the ERP bill last spring.

The President will have to take a definite stand very soon. Great Britain seems to be preparing to shape a plan to cope with the danger in the Orient. If the Presi-

dent intends to mend the broken wing of our Far Eastern policy, appropriations for this purpose will have to go far beyond the allowance made for them in his budget message. In that case, in order to balance the budget, the President will have to curtail other proposed expenditures.

Our Far Eastern policy has already been allowed to lag two years behind our policy in Europe. Unless the American eagle is to be grounded by the year's end, Mr. Truman had better come up with an effective strategy for Asia—and soon.

Prospects for prosperity

As the President and his Council of Economic Advisers see it, in the President's economic report to Congress on January 7, the country must continue to walk a tight-rope between inflation and deflation if it is to pass from the postwar boom into a period of stable prosperity. Both dangers are present in the economy and must be dealt with simultaneously.

The year gone by was very prosperous, even though some segments of the population fell behind in the race between consumer prices and personal incomes. Employment averaged more than fifty-nine million, industrial production was up between three and four per cent and farm output about nine per cent. Corporate profits were at record-breaking levels. Toward the end of the year the consumer price index, chiefly because of a decline in farm prices, dropped a point or two below the all-time peak reached in August and September. For the future the President was optimistic. "I believe," he said, "that prosperity can be continued and that, with proper action, the prospective volume of business investment, consumer spending and governmental transactions should promote ample employment opportunities for the coming year."

What the President meant by "proper action" was spelled out in a series of recommendations to the national Congress and to leaders of our large economic groups.

From the Congress he wanted substantially the same anti-inflationary program he requested last July. This includes standby authority to fix prices and wages on a selective basis, should the necessity arise, as well as mandatory controls over key materials in short supply. He demanded additional tax revenue of \$4 billion and an increase in the social-security tax. The former should come principally from corporate profits, since these "are in excess of the levels needed to furnish incentives and equity funds for industrial expansion and to promote sustained economic health." His last request, the power to deal with inadequate industrial capacity, is explained in some detail elsewhere in these pages.

In several passages the President emphasized that prosperity over the long run is to a considerable extent dependent on the wise decisions of leaders of labor, industrial management and agriculture. They play the decisive role in establishing the proper relationships between production and consumption, income and investment, prices, profits and wages. Over the present relationship between profits and wages, and between consumer and other types

of spending, he expressed some concern. He thought that the ratio between profits and sales, which was about five per cent after taxes, was too high. On the other hand, he did not like the present proportion of consumer expenditures in the total national product, which was never lower in any peace-time year for which records are available. He rightly pointed out that unless something were done to bolster consumer purchasing power, we would be headed for serious trouble as soon as government spending, business investment and the excess of exports over imports dropped to more normal levels.

Economists will quarrel among themselves over many aspects of the President's message, notably over his stress on the relationship between consumer purchasing power and stabilized prosperity. Without in any way minimizing the importance of this and similar questions, we think that the message has a much wider significance. From it emerges a new concept of economic society toward which the nation has been feeling its way for the past fifteen years. From now on the Government expects from private economic groups positive help in maintaining high levels of production and employment. Laissez-faire is giving way to some as yet obscure form of democratic planning.

"Let's kill the poor beasts"

That's exactly the reasoning (if it can be called that) behind the petition signed by 379 Protestant and Jewish clergymen recently, calling on the New York State Legislature to legalize euthanasia, or "mercy-killing." These blind guides invoke the name of God. They refuse to believe that He "wills the prolongation of physical torture for the benefit of the soul of the sufferer." It is impossible, however, to reconcile their utter materialism with any rational belief in God.

Their own words prove their materialism. They see no difference between human beings and sub-human animals:

We believe that such a sufferer has the right to die, and that society should grant this right, showing the same mercy to human beings as to the sub-human animal kingdom.

They top off this vicious comparison by invoking the words of Our Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount: "Blessed are the merciful."

What fog of earthiness prevents these supposedly intellectual religious leaders from seeing that this is simply barnyard morality? Once the premise is granted that animals and men should be treated equally for the avoidance of pain, the floodgates are open for likening men to beasts in every way. The natural law of morality does not impose the sexual restraints on "sub-human animals" that it imposes on morally bound agents. Why, then, not allow humans the same promiscuity? We drown a litter of kittens, not because they are suffering, but because they are not wanted. Why not do the same with babies who are "not wanted"? If this principle is accepted, the whole of human life will be degraded, dehumanized and demoralized.

Beyond the moral turpitude of euthanasia, there lies its denial of the asceticism of suffering. The whole history of Christianity is glorious with examples of millions who have joined their sufferings with those of Our Divine Lord and have so become holy. That these ministers of religion are blind to this truth is an appalling commentary on the low estate of spirituality in some "religious" circles.

But these 379 do not speak for a unanimous following. Dr. John W. Behnken, president of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod condemns them. He states that "the Lutheran Church will disassociate itself completely from this renewed attempt by men to solve human problems by arrogating to themselves the means that only God can rightfully use."

Well said! But isn't it time for all Protestant and Jewish leaders publicly to disown their fellows who preach a doctrine that brutalizes man, violates God's sovereign rights and prostitutes the words of Christ?

Danger from South Africa

Twenty years ago, Dr. Kenyon L. Butterfield, research visitor for the Carnegie Corporation, was sent to make a study of educational progress in Africa. He remarked at the close of his report:

South Africa is not Africa, and yet one cannot explore the problems of South Africa without becoming conscious of the stupendous significance of the continent of Africa as a whole, and of the fact that nearly all of the problems which the people of South Africa are obliged to face have an intimate bearing upon the outcome of the adventure of the western nations in the development of the Dark Continent.

What was true in 1929 is doubly true today, as Dr. Butterfield's prophecy shows signs of fulfillment: that European and American ideas would steadily develop among the natives of Africa. These ideas were certain to cause new tensions when they conflicted with colonial practices.

The world today is disturbed over the action of South Africa's present Nationalist Government in violently denying the native population even elementary human rights. In the words of Bishop Hennemann, S.A.C., of Cape Town, addressed to his clergy last September: "The recent restrictions . . . are only the beginning of other attacks upon the liberties and dignity of the non-white citizens" (A.M. 10/16/48, p. 33).

It is difficult to think of anything more menacing to the peace of Africa, and so to the peace of the world, than last January's announcement by B. J. Schouman, South Africa's Minister of Labor, to the effect that all training of natives as artisans must be stopped immediately. Minister Schouman's action brought an immediate protest from Major van der Byl, former Minister of National Affairs in the South African Republic. Mr. Schouman's action, said Van der Byl, "meant that having been driven out of the white areas, the natives would not be allowed to rise above the status of unskilled laborers even within their own reserve." He warned the Government that by engendering bitterness and despair among the natives,

they would "screw down the safety valve," and that "sooner or later an explosion would occur that would be disastrous outside of South Africa."

The first sputterings leading to such an explosion have already been heard, for political relations between whites and Negroes in South Africa were broken off on January 5 of this year. The rupture was occasioned by a meeting in Pretoria of the Negro Representative Council called by the new Nationalist Government "so that requirements of law might be carried out," but in reality to hear its own death sentence, since the present Administration is pledged to end such representation.

The Government is acting on the avowed principle of *apartheid*, or racial segregation, complete separation, territorially and culturally, of the white and non-white races. This type of action was referred to by Bishop Hennemann, in his vigorous pastoral, as "a weapon of political action and expediency, a noxious, un-Christian and destructive policy." The Negroes have replied by deciding to continue to boycott all meetings "until the Government through a Minister of the Crown lays before the Council . . . full details of its native policy."

The South Africans, as was explained last April by their Minister to Washington, Harry T. Andrews, are concerned about the trade disparity that exists between their country and the United States. A prosperous South Africa means no inconsiderable market for American industrial products, particularly for American motor cars, tractors, trucks, etc. But South Africa is extremely dependent upon native labor as a factor of prime importance in the development of their own rich natural resources. If such a development takes place along lines which respect a laborer's natural rights, it will result in tangible benefits not only for the people of South Africa but for the rest of the world as well. But these same benefits will be doubtful and precarious if they are gained at the price of inhuman exploitation, of practical peonage, of bitter discontent and frustration on the part of the native populations.

By a series of restrictive actions, by removing prohibitions on membership in two violently nationalist and white-supremacy organizations, and by their threats of further excesses, the Nationalists have committed themselves to what the rest of the world can regard only as a policy of desperation. Their refusal to submit any trusteeship plan for their League of Nations mandate in Southwest Africa, along with their embroilment with the East Indians resident in South Africa, has stirred up the alarms of all native Africa, and of the peoples of sufficiently agitated Southeast Asia as well. It is no time for encouraging firebrands, whether they hail from Moscow or from Pretoria. Among the white population of South Africa there is stout resistance to the Nationalist madness, not only among the British element but also among many of the progressive and patriotic Afrikaners. American foreign policy, which showed such vacillations in the General Assembly debates on the trusteeship problem, should understand what is here signified, and give firm support to the forces of sanity in the South African Union.

A-Bombs away!

Edward A. Conway

"French announce successful operation of atomic-energy pile," screamed the headlines in mid-December. Reading how French scientists had built, at the "bargain basement price" of about \$10 million, a nuclear reactor, or chain-reacting pile, which makes energy out of uranium atoms, Mr. American Citizen doubtless turned to his wife and said: "There, the secret of the A-Bomb is out; what's more, the head of the French project is Frédéric Joliot-Curie, an avowed Communist, and his wife is well known for her anti-American bias. Guess we're in for it. Russia'll have the bomb in no time."

Will it do any good to remind Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen that since 1945 U.S. atomic scientists have been trying to tell them that there never was any "secret" of the A-bomb in the usual sense of the term; that any nation, using data universally available, would eventually be able to construct a bomb?

Perhaps now Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen will listen to the scientists when they repeat that the problem of controlling atomic energy is the paramount problem of our times, and that we must begin to give it the attention its seriousness deserves. The French success is not only a major scientific achievement, comparable to that of Enrico Fermi, Leo Szilard and their associates in 1942, when they set off the first atomic pile at the University of Chicago; it changes the whole frame of reference within which atomic control must be considered.

So the French are on the way to the A-Bomb, and are at present where the U.S. was in 1942, with, however, much additional knowledge, which we did not then have, of steps yet to be taken. If temporary reassurance is of any value, I might add that the present pile at Fort de Chatillon cannot provide the fissionable material for an A-Bomb. It would take hundreds of years for it to produce enough plutonium for that. The reason lies in the nature of the reactor. It is what is called by the scientists a low-energy pile, which produces only microscopic amounts of plutonium. The small piles at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the Argonne Laboratory (Chicago), Chalk River Laboratory (Ontario), Harwell Laboratory (England) and the pile being built at Brookhaven National Laboratory (Long Island) are all examples of low-energy laboratory piles.

These use natural uranium as mined, and turn out radio-isotopes for use by research workers in physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, agriculture and industry. Such piles are entirely distinct from and in no way dependent on the large-scale atomic production plants, which generate terrific amounts of heat and therefore large amounts of plutonium and U-235. This distinction between the small-scale low-energy laboratory pile and the large-scale high-energy atomic production pile is all-important in the discussion of atomic-energy control.

The field of atomic energy is physically separable into

Atomic-energy control seems to many to have reached a dreary deadlock where one side keeps saying Yes, and the other keeps saying No. Father Conway points out a possible way of reaching agreement which has hitherto been by-passed.

two parts—the production of radio-isotopes and neutron radiation for use as research tools, and the production of nuclear fuel (U-235 and plutonium) for use today in bombs and some day (perhaps) in atomic-power plants. The distinction is simply a matter of size.

There is no question but that the French will eventually have much larger atomic piles. From their present small chain-reactor they expect to build two larger ones within the next five years. So we are actually teetering on the brink of what Edward Brodie calls the "post-monopoly period" (*Foreign Affairs*, October, 1948), when other nations, and specifically Russia, will have begun to produce atomic bombs. I do not take the comfort he does from the argument that even when the Soviet Union produces its first bomb, we shall have many more than we do at present, and that our present superiority in atomic armaments will increase considerably before it begins to wane. I am more concerned with his conclusion: "What will occur in this country when the conviction settles upon it that the Soviet Union is producing bombs is the big question of the future." That is why I said some time ago ("Cease and desist, Mr. Austin," AM. 10/23/48) that

the atomic armament race must be stopped now, not a year from now. Let us do what needs to be done at once. That means coming to an interim agreement, based upon a recognition of the present scientific and political realities, which will stop the mad massing of atomic weapons.

The success of the French pile has increased a thousand-fold the necessity for such an interim agreement.

DEADLOCK IN UN COMMISSION

After more than 200 meetings, the UN Atomic Energy Commission, on May 17, 1948, reported itself deadlocked, and the majority submitted its Report for transmission to the General Assembly "as a matter of special concern." After long and fruitless debate at Paris the majority report was forced through the Assembly. The U.S. delegation had tried to obtain the indefinite suspension of the Commission until Russia would accept the majority report. Wiser counsel among the smaller nations prevailed, and the Assembly, on October 20, called upon the six permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission "to meet together and consult in order to determine if there exists a basis for agreement on international control of atomic energy." It also summoned the Commission to resume its sessions, "and to proceed to further study of such of the subjects remaining in the program of work as it considers to be practicable and useful."

The impasse in the Commission arose largely from inability to agree on ways of controlling the dangerous large-scale plants producing U-235 and plutonium for use in atomic power installations. The majority of the

UNAEC agreed with the U.S. thesis that these plants should be owned and managed by an international authority, since the large quantities of U-235 and plutonium which they produce may be readily made into atomic weapons. The Russian negotiators said that international ownership would be an unwarranted interference in Russia's internal economy. This was their *stated* objection. Their real objection, of course, is that the inspection required for efficient control of large scale plants would **tear the Iron Curtain to tatters**. As one UNAEC member said wryly: "The U.S. cannot survive without international control; with it, the USSR cannot survive unchanged." Now that the English Nobel Prize Winner, P. M. S. Blackett, British apologist for the Soviets, has bolstered their case with arguments the Russians themselves never thought of, we must face the unpleasant fact that it is absolutely hopeless to continue seeking Russian agreement to the majority proposals as they now stand.

That does not mean that we must despair. As Edward Brodie has said: "**We must continue our search for a workable and secure international control system by any corridor which reflects even a glimmer of hope of success.**"

One corridor which to date has not been explored is marked "The Power Moratorium or Zero Quota Proposal" (PM-ZQ). It was to this I referred in my previous article when I said that I would discuss one possible interim solution. I suggest it now to the six permanent members of the UNAEC, who, presumably, are following the Assembly's injunction to seek out "a basis for agreement," though there is no indication in the press that they are doing so.

The PM-ZQ proposal is not mine. It has a history as long as the atomic age, and its parentage, scientifically speaking, is highly respectable. It was widely discussed by atomic and political scientists in early 1946, before the appearance of the Acheson-Lilienthal Report, which formed the basis of the original American proposals in UNAEC. To my knowledge PM-ZQ has never received comment in an official U.S. document. I do know that its proponents have had difficulty getting a hearing for it from the U.S. Atomic Delegation. Two of the earliest sponsors of the plan thus described it (Cuthbert Daniel and Arthur M. Squires in *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, May, 1947, pp. 113-114):

Let there be a world agreement that no new industrial atomic plants be built anywhere in the world for a number of years. Let there be established an Atomic Development Authority along the lines proposed by the United States, with responsibility for world geological surveys, inspection against illegal activities leading toward bomb manufacture, and operation of laboratories for nuclear research and pilot plants for development of methods of U-235 enrichment and plutonium production.

Under their proposal neither the ADA nor any other group would have power

to mine and process uranium and thorium on a large scale; to operate reactors or separation plants which produce large quantities of material usable in bombs, to operate facilities for making atomic weapons, or for research and development in military uses.

Their reason, expressed in the halcyon days of 1947, was: "These activities, let the world agree, *are too dangerous for our time*, since they guarantee national rivalry in the field of atomic energy at an extremely dangerous level" (emphasis supplied).

Leo Szilard, inventor of the plutonium pile, and now Professor of Biophysics at the University of Chicago, first raised, in words that now appear prophetic, the question of a power moratorium in a secret memorandum to President Roosevelt in March, 1945, four months before Alamogordo:

There might perhaps be a satisfactory solution to the problem of reconciling the requirements of safety of the United States with the desire not to hamper the development of atomic power for industrial purposes. *Unfortunately it is by no means sure that a satisfactory solution of this problem is in fact possible. It would be much easier, safer, and would require a much less tight control, to arrest the development of atomic power by scrapping and outlawing the large and easily visible installations which characterize the first stage of this development* (emphasis supplied).

Szilard's warning was repeated on June 11, 1945 by a committee of scientists at the University of Chicago. Under the chairmanship of James Franck, Professor of Physical Chemistry, they addressed a memorandum to the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. To all the johnny-come-lately second-guessers among the political scientists who now belittle the atomic scientists as political babes in the wood, I commend the following:

Given mutual trust, and willingness on all sides to give up a certain part of their sovereign rights, by admitting international control of certain phases of national economy, the control could be exercised (alternatively or simultaneously) on two different levels. The first and simplest way is to ration the raw material—primarily the uranium ores . . . and each nation could be allotted only an amount which could make large-scale separation of fissionable isotopes impossible. Such a limitation would have the drawback of making impossible also the development of nuclear power for peacetime purposes. However, it need not prevent the production of radioactive elements on a scale sufficient to revolutionize the industrial, scientific and technical use of these materials. . . .

An agreement on a higher level, involving more mutual trust and understanding, would be to allow unlimited production, but keep exact bookkeeping on the fate of each pound of uranium mined . . . (emphasis supplied).

In the fall of 1945, Professors Urey, Langmuir, Szilard and others, while testifying before the Senate's Atomic Energy Committee, expressed willingness to delay the development of atomic power if such delay would make war less likely. The authors of the Chicago Draft Convention proposed in 1946 a five-year delay in construction of large-scale power plants. Cuthbert Daniel and Arthur M. Squires, chemical engineer and physical chemist respectively, made an elaborate and convincing case for PM-ZQ in May, 1947. David Cavers, Harvard Law School faculty member, proposed independently an almost identical plan in October, 1947.

To this layman it seems passing strange that no official

cognizance has ever been taken of these solidly scientific proposals. It may be that, having made a bad initial blunder, the U.S. delegation has feared to put forward a plan which would expose that mistake. The original U.S. proposals took it for granted that large-scale atomic power was just around the corner. So they looked forward to the continued operation of our big plants at Oak Ridge and Hanford, and the early construction of similar plants in other countries, all under international control. By the end of 1945, so many optimistic predictions had been made as to the immediate prospects of atomic power that few remembered the two alternatives clearly indicated by Szilard and the Franck memorandum: either large-scale atomic production could be banned, thus immensely simplifying the control problem, or it could be permitted under strict supervision of an international agency.

The original Acheson-Lilienthal Report, while not specifically rejecting the former alternative, eliminated it from consideration by adopting an all-or-nothing attitude toward atomic technology: "To 'outlaw' atomic energy in all its forms," said the Report, "and enforce such a prohibition by an army of inspectors roaming the earth, would overwhelm the capacity and endurance of men, and provide no security." After this glance at the difficulty of halting *all* work, the Report accepted the "alternative" of continuing *all* currently known activities, which the Report put in two categories: "safe" activities, permitted to private or national agencies, and "dangerous" activities, reserved to the ADA.

There is of course a whole spectrum of other alternatives. Now is the time to explore them. *Some*, not necessarily *all*, atomic activities may have to be simply forbidden; they may be too dangerous and, from their very nature, scientifically uncontrollable and politically inexpedient.

In the year following the presentation of the American proposals on June 14, 1946, we found that economic atomic power is *not* just around the corner. Nearly everyone now agrees on this fact of capital importance in this whole question. The UNAEC's General Advisory Committee of leading atomic scientists and engineers stated on February 2, 1948:

Assuming even a most favorable and rapid technical development . . . a word of caution is needed as to time scale. *We do not see how it would be possible, under the most favorable circumstances, to have any considerable portion of the present power supply of the world derived from nuclear fuel before the expiration of twenty years* (emphasis supplied).

Recognizing this fact, the majority in the UNAEC in the summer of 1947 introduced a major modification into the plan under discussion. They agreed that there should be no stockpiling of nuclear fuel until atomic power is a practical and immediate possibility.

When and if the time comes that atomic energy can be used to produce power on an economical basis, the international agency should, subject to requirements of security, make such power available. The disposition of existing stockpiles and the transition to the eventual distribution should be considered when the Commission examines the stages by which

transition will be accomplished from conditions of national control to the final conditions of predominantly international control.

The Commission, however, has refused to spell out the implications of that statement. As the foregoing quotation indicates, it has not even discussed the fundamental question of stages leading to full international control. If the question of stages had been explored, it would have quickly developed that the proposed method of control of large-scale production, on which so much time has been spent in debate, will not be needed for nearly a quarter-century. Yet what has been holding up agreement, or, perhaps I should say, what is the chief *stated* point at issue between the majority and the Soviet bloc is precisely the method by which large-scale production should be controlled. *The basis for this controversy disappears if it is agreed that no large nuclear plants and*

no large stockpiles shall exist for a period of years. Thus it appears that the deadlock in the UNAEC, over which the world is becoming increasingly anxious, can be resolved by a power moratorium, or zero-quota compromise. This compromise would postpone the whole debate over the way in which large atomic plants should be controlled, and where



they shall be established, until engineers can give firm estimates of the costs, benefits and dangers of atomic power.

Distinct security advantages would flow from the zero-quota plan during the coming years of international tension; in fact, one might say that it puts distrust to constructive use. 1) Seizure of legal large-scale atomic plants would be ruled out; they would not exist. 2) The same goes for theft of U-235 and plutonium from such plants. (No one has ever explained to me how it would be possible to prevent the theft of small amounts of the bomb material, which might add up, over a period of time, to enough for a number of bombs.) 3) While there would be some need for inspection of the small nuclear reactors permitted, that inspection would be comparatively easy. 4) So would surveillance to make sure that large-scale plants were not being built. "We believe," said Daniel Squires in 1947, "that an inspection system can give more positive assurance that no large-scale illegal bomb programs exist than that no fissionable material is diverted to small, hidden bomb-assembly plants or that groups do not plan seizures."

In other words, it is far easier to find out whether a country is building a large-scale plant than to detect the illegal diversion of bomb material from such a plant already in existence.

I hope to discuss in a future article the price the United States would have to pay, in terms of security and prosperity, for release from the fear of atomic attack which is mounting alarmingly in our land. Meanwhile,

as the UNAEC prepares to resume its deliberations, I earnestly urge the U.S. delegation to propose to the six permanent members of the Commission as a "basis for agreement," the power moratorium, or zero quota compromise. Still true today are these words of David Cavers, written in 1947:

"The way is still clear for the United States Government to attempt the achievement of both atomic disarmament and non-atomic disarmament, without sacrifice of the security of this nation or of the world, by proposing a prohibition of facilities to provide atomic energy for power until a safer stage is reached in the evolution of world organization. If it should do so, the United States would erect a milestone in the progress of modern man as a political animal. The action would represent his first demonstration that he can gear the exploitation of his scientific knowledge to the development of his capacity to govern himself."

Manipulating reports from China

Benjamin L. Masse

From Tsingtao, China, on January 4, the Associated Press reported that the U.S. Marines had just announced their impending withdrawal from China "since the Chinese Government has decided to negotiate for a peace settlement with the Reds and there is good prospect for peace being restored." The story continued:

It was the first official announcement that the hard-pressed Chinese Government is suing for peace with the dominant Chinese Communists. China has been rife with rumors of peace for nearly two weeks.

The announcement said some 3,000 Marines would be put aboard naval vessels in Tsingtao harbor to await further orders for movement—expected prior to Jan. 25.

The same day, this time from Shanghai, the Associated Press carried the following denial of the Tsingtao dispatch:

Official United States sources in Shanghai denied today a report from Tsingtao that American Marines were leaving shore billets to withdraw from that western Pacific anchorage in North China.

These sources expressed belief the report stemmed from the evacuation of a group of shopkeepers at the Marine shore quarters at Shantung University at Tsingtao.

At this point, in the snarled events of that day, the story shifted to Washington. The Associated Press reported:

State Department officials expressed surprise tonight at the announcement of the withdrawal of United States Marines from China.

Officials here said that no previous information had been received to support definitely the idea that the Nationalist Government was talking with the Communists.

Both the Navy Department and the Marine Corps said that they had not been advised of the Tsingtao developments. . . .

There was no immediate comment from the White House tonight on the Tsingtao announcement.

The sensational dispatch from Tsingtao and the denial from Shanghai both reached New York too late for the evening papers on January 3. (Because of the international date-line, when it's January 4 in China it's January 3 in the United States.) But the next morning the *Herald Tribune* and the *Times* slapped the stories on page one. In modest type the *Tribune* headed its account: "Withdrawal of Marines in China Denied." It ran the Shanghai dispatch first, then the Tsingtao report, finally the story from Washington.

The *Times* handled the story with all the enthusiasm of a tabloid. To the startled reader a banner three-column headline in (for the *Times*) big, black, 36-point type shouted: "Nanking Is Suing for Peace with Reds, Our Marines Say; U.S. Force Plans to Leave." Underneath there appeared first the already discredited AP report from Tsingtao, then the Washington story. The Shanghai dispatch was boiled down to thirteen lines and inserted, between parentheses, after the first paragraph of the Tsingtao account.

That evening the New York *Sun* carried another AP dispatch from Shanghai. (The *World-Telegram* had substantially the same story from the United Press, which never did send the false report from Tsingtao.) These are the especially pertinent parts of the AP release:

Vice Admiral Oscar C. Badger today denied that United States forces were being withdrawn from China.

Admiral Badger, commander of the Western Pacific Fleet, said the "rumors were based on reports that United States Marines had terminated their lease on the Shantung University campus where they maintain their barracks."

Admiral Badger made his denial in a cabled statement from his Tsingtao base to the Associated Press in Shanghai.

The next morning the *Times* carried the same story. It threw in an AP explanation of the erroneous Tsingtao dispatch: the cable desk at San Francisco interpreted the withdrawal from the barracks on the campus of Shantung University as withdrawal from China!

In its issue of January 6 the *Times* wrote *finis* to the whole amazing affair. Editorializing on the prospect for peace in China, it said: "The news from China has of late been more confusing than enlightening, and some of it has been admittedly 'premature.'"

To this sentiment the present writer, who has a high regard both for the Associated Press and the New York *Times*, would like to say "Amen." But under the circumstances ought one to dismiss this incident so casually? May there not be much more here than meets the eye?

For China these are extremely critical days. The day the Tsingtao dispatch was filed, the month-old battle north of Nanking was still undecided. To his 400,000,000 suffering, war-weary people Chiang Kai-shek had just given a policy statement in the form of a New Year's message. The communist radio was replying with slanders, threats and insults. In the United States the wife of the Generalissimo awaited an answer to her plea for the economic and military aid which alone could save her

country's freedom. Well-informed Americans were urging President Truman that it was not yet too late to preserve China from the horrible fate of Poland, Rumania, Hungary and their sister nations in Eastern Europe. In some Washington circles the seductive voice of appeasement could be heard again. "The Chinese Communists were different; they would not accept dictation from Moscow." "The coalition governments which led to slavery in Eastern Europe would in China bring unity and peace." "Anyhow, the Nationalist Government has lost the war. It is doomed. Let the United States cut its losses, withdraw its Marines and try to do business with whatever government takes over."

It was in these delicate and parlous circumstances that our most authoritative news-gathering agency announced to the world not only that the United States was withdrawing its forces from China, but that this action "was the first official announcement that the hard-pressed Chinese Government is suing for peace with the dominant Chinese Communists."

If one more push were needed to topple Chiang Kai-shek, it is conceivable that this dispatch might have done it. It was a blow to morale in Nationalist China, a shot in the arm to the Communists, a crushing setback to those in this country who were fighting, primarily in the interest of American security, to save as much of the Orient as possible from domination by the Kremlin. A paid Soviet propagandist would not have changed a word in the AP dispatch from Tsingtao on January 4.

To attribute the blunder, as the AP has done, to a misunderstanding at the cable desk in San Francisco is obviously no explanation at all. Granted that someone did misinterpret "evacuation from the University of Shantung campus" to mean "evacuation of the Marines from China," should not someone in authority have checked this sensational piece of news before, not after, it was sent to the far corners of the earth? More serious still: the AP did not merely report that the Marines were leaving China; it reported that *the Marines had announced* they were leaving China, and that this "was the first official announcement" that Chiang was suing for peace. It was in giving this official character to the news that the chief harm of the dispatch lay. The AP "explanation" completely ignores this.

The case of the New York *Times* is more curious still. Though the *Times* had in its possession the denial from Shanghai—part of which it actually incorporated in its story—it gave the headlines as well as the big spot in the news columns to the false report from Tsingtao. This treatment, as we have seen, was in marked contrast with that of the *Herald Tribune*, which quite properly refused to emphasize a story that had already been authoritatively denied. Is it impertinent to ask who at the *Times* was responsible for this dangerous blunder, and why?

The *Times* unit of the New York Chapter of the American Newspaper Guild happens to be one of the few in town which did not elect a right-wing slate of officers in the recent December election. Is there possibly some connection between this fact and the tragically misleading headline on January 4? This question is even more in

order when one remembers the facility with which communist fronts, without any indication of their character, manage to secure space in the *Times*. Instead of dismissing this whole incident with an airy reference to "premature" news, maybe the Editor of the *Times*, so far as this is legitimate, ought to investigate the ideological bent of whoever was responsible for the heading over the China story. And the AP might well look into the antecedents of the correspondent who filed the mendacious dispatch from Tsingtao.

Triumph over racism

Robert F. Drinan, S.J.

When Sylvester S. Davis Jr., aged 27, and Andrea D. Perez, aged 23, his fiancée, asked the Los Angeles county clerk on August 8, 1947 to issue them a marriage license, the clerk refused.

We know that there was nothing about Mr. Davis or Miss Perez that in any way distinguished them from hundreds of thousands of other young couples who have been granted marriage licenses by church or civil authorities from time immemorial in regions without number on the surface of the globe. Save for one item, there was nothing to distinguish them from hundreds of thousands of similar couples in every part of the United States. That one item was the fact that the groom was what is known in this country as a "Negro" or "colored man," and the bride-to-be was what is technically referred to as "white." And between the two of them stood the obstacle of a 76-year-old California law.

But in the case of Mr. Davis and Miss Perez there was still another circumstance, which the framers of this 76-year-old law had not taken into consideration as a possibility. Both of the young people were members of the Catholic Church, members of the same parish, and both considered marriage as a religious, indeed a sacred and sacramental, act. By that token it is also an exercise of religious liberty. There was a Catholic lawyer in Los Angeles who had pondered a little more deeply than most people on what were the ultimate rights and wrongs in such matters. As a consequence of the young couple's consultations with this lawyer, and subsequent proceedings, there was pronounced by the Supreme Court of California one of the most memorable legal decisions in the history of this country.

Prior to the Civil War almost every State in the Union enacted a law forbidding marriages between white persons and Negroes. These statutes made such unions "void" or "null and void," and a violation of any of these laws was a criminal offense. After the Emancipation Proclamation these statutes continued on the books, and are still fully binding in twenty-nine States. In addition to this ban, fifteen States forbid the marriages of white persons with Mongolians; ten States do not allow marriages between white persons and the members of the Malay race; and five States proscribe Indian-white

unions. The majority of these States punish the religious or civil officers who knowingly violate the statute.

These laws have been frequently held constitutional by the Supreme Courts of the various States, on the grounds that the State has the power to regulate the tripartite relationship of marriage. Sometimes, in their opinions, the courts have alleged an inferiority in the progeny of racial intermarriages, but generally the prohibition has been sustained as sound public policy. Legal writers universally say the constitutionality of these laws is "well settled." As late as 1944 the law of Oklahoma against miscegenation was upheld by a Federal court of appeals as not violative of the Federal Constitution. The Supreme Court of the United States has never decided the constitutionality of these restrictions on marriage. It is remarkable to note that, *outside of the Union of South Africa, the United States is the only nation in the world where such laws obtain.*

The laws against "miscegenation" are generally enforced rigorously. No couple falling within the regulation may go outside the State, be married and then return. The marriage will be declared void from the start. There has been absolutely no tendency to repeal or to mitigate these laws in any way. In this century not one has been repealed by a legislature or invalidated by a court.

Vernier, in his definitive five-volume *American Family Laws*, is authority for the statement that statutes against interracial marriage are not grounded in any scientific rationale but only in local prejudice. In *The Legal Status of the Negro*, Charles S. Mangum, after a careful examination of the reasoning in every reported case on racial intermarriage, confirms this conclusion.

California, like most other States, enacted a law forbidding interracial marriage in the first session of its legislature in 1850. In 1905 the law was amended to include Mongolians, and in 1933, after a Filipino-white marriage had been upheld by the courts as not falling under the ban, members of the Malay race were brought within the statute. It was therefore most surprising when on October 1, 1948 the California Supreme Court, by a vote of 4 to 3, declared unconstitutional the law which would forbid marriage of any white person with a "Negro, mulatto, Mongolian or a member of the Malay race."

The case resulting in this amazing verdict arose in this way. Sylvester Davis, as we have said, and Andrea Perez applied for a marriage license and were refused. Daniel G. Marshall, attorney and militant president of the Los Angeles Catholic Interracial Council, heard of their plight and took their case. He brought *mandamus* proceedings against the county clerk of Los Angeles. After fourteen months of battling and waiting, Mr. Marshall won his case when the Supreme Court of California reversed the lower courts' decision. As the *Nation* reported on October 16, the civil-liberties organizations gave Mr. Marshall little if any help, and his victory is a great personal achievement. He has brought about a judicial decision absolutely unique in American history.

The petitioners contended that the law forbidding intermarriage was unconstitutional because it infringed on their right to the free exercise of their religion. Their

Church does not prevent marriages between Negroes and Caucasians, and therefore the civil law may not constitutionally deny them the right to participate fully in the sacraments of their religion. The Court answered carefully that "if the statute is directed at a social evil and employs a reasonable means to prevent the evil, it is valid, regardless of its incidental effect upon the conduct of particular groups"; but that "if the law is discriminatory and irrational, it unconstitutionally restricts not only religious liberty but the liberty to marry as well." The Court then pointed out that such laws are discriminatory and unreasonable, and thus by inference clearly stated that the statute in question violated religious liberty and was therefore inconsistent with the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution. The freedom of religion guaranteed by the First Amendment is encompassed in the liberties guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. State legislatures, therefore, are no more competent than Congress to pass laws violating religious liberty. The masterly majority opinion written by Roger Traynor puts this violation of religious liberty at the head, and quite clearly the whole case turns on it.

The Court finds, moreover, that the right to marry is a "fundamental right of free men," protected by the due-process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and that "a statute which prohibits an individual from marrying a member of a race other than his own restricts the scope of his choice and thereby restricts his right to marry." Such a statute is permissible only when a clear and present peril arising out of an emergency makes it imperative. Otherwise the State cannot base a "law impairing fundamental rights of individuals on general assumptions as to traits of racial groups."

The majority vigorously refutes the contentions of the respondent. "There is no scientific proof that one race is superior to another in native ability." Nor can the statutes be justified as a means of diminishing tension between the races, because such an aim "cannot be accomplished by laws which deny rights created or protected by the Federal Constitution." Nor is it sensible to believe that "race tension can be eradicated through the perpetuation by law of the prejudices that give rise to the tension." And the Court adds pointedly: "If miscegenous marriages can be prohibited because of tensions suffered by the progeny, mixed religious unions could be prohibited on the same ground."

The court concludes by saying that the statutes are too vague and uncertain to be binding. No definition is offered for its most important terms—"Negro, mulatto, Mongolian, members of the Malay race"—none of which is capable of a definite classification. (Cf. "Just What Is a Negro?" by Rev. Dr. John T. Gillard, S.S.J. AM. 6/26/36; G. Myrdal, *An American Dilemma*. Harper. Vol. I, Ch. 5, pp. 113 sq.)

The concurring opinion asserts that the statutes involved were never constitutional and are the product of "ignorance, prejudice and intolerance." The fact that California grants recognition to foreign miscegenous marriages, contrary to the policy of most States with such laws, is enough to rebut the contention that the

laws prevent race riots—because “riots would follow in both cases or none.”

No appeal from the judgment was taken within the time fixed by law; so the case will not go to the United States Supreme Court.

This remarkable decision is without doubt a triumph over racism. It is a victory for civil liberties which could well open a new era of equality before the law for the Negro race. It is also a vindication of the position of the Church, dictated by the natural law, that no one race is essentially inferior to any other. The Church does not place any impediment against racial intermarriages. But neither, under the circumstances existing in the United States, does it encourage them. As the Rev. John La Farge, S.J., says in *The Race Question and the Negro*, a book used by the litigants in their briefs and quoted in the Court's opinion: “Quite independently of any dubious biological consideration, there are grave reasons against any general practice of intermarriage between the members of different racial groups. These reasons, where clearly verified, amount to a moral prohibition of such a practice.”

The “reasons” that Fr. LaFarge had in mind, according to his own explanation, are simply the social tensions which are apt to accompany such a union under the conditions that ordinarily prevail in the United States. The moral prohibition would cease to exist where, as in other lands, the matrimonial fidelity of the marriage partners would not be exposed to the strain of social ostracism; or where, *within* the United States, a couple

might hope to enjoy circumstances that are definitely favorable for the comfort of such a union. In the last analysis it is a matter to be determined by enlightened prudence, by frank honesty in facing and estimating the full reality of the marriage's social consequences. With the steady advance of the Negro's cultural status, and the corresponding advance in his integration into the general social and cultural pattern, circumstances favorable to racial intermarriage may be expected to become more numerous. However, for a long time they will remain definitely the exception, not the rule.

At any rate, there has been no marked tendency to any such racial amalgamation in the past few years. Nor is it likely that the repeal of “anti-miscegenation” laws would create any such tendency. No Negro group favors racial intermarriage, and no white interracial-justice council offers it as the solution of our racial problem. But the laws restraining such unions are none the less unjust, because they are predicated on racial inequality, on the same principles of segregation and discrimination which isolate the colored people from the nation as a whole.

There should, of course, be no agitation to repeal such statutes since 1) it is unrealistic to expect any such repeal, and 2) such a course of action might perpetuate the fallacy that Negroes, as a general practice, desire to intermarry. But let us be grateful to the participants in *Perez v. Lippold* and to the California Supreme Court for voiding laws which are anachronistic, discriminatory and, under our Federal law, unconstitutional.

How to jail a Cardinal

John O'Connor

(The following is a series of excerpts from broadcasts made by the various commentators on radio stations behind the Iron Curtain. How the statements arrived in this country must remain undisclosed at this time for reasons of security. J. O'C.)

The arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty was indirectly forecast months ago on the various radio stations controlled by the communist Quislings throughout Eastern Europe. On October 12, 1948 the Prague radio station carried a digest of an article from the *New Times* (Moscow). Written by a Soviet commentator, Minyaev, it stated in part:

U.S. diplomats . . . organized subversive activities in the countries of southeastern Europe. . . . A certain U.S. consular employe in Czechoslovakia, when dissatisfied with the work of his agents, undertook himself to photograph military objectives in the border region. Similar instances were reported from Hungary.

Four or five days later another mild dose of preparation

John O'Connor, Fordham graduate and member of the faculty of Seton Hall College, South Orange, New Jersey, does a further teaching stretch two nights a week at St. Peter's College, Jersey City. Mr. O'Connor is also the Jersey news scout for the Catholic News of New York.

was administered. Radio Budapest quoted the then Premier of Hungary as saying to the Red-controlled trade unions: “. . . The Hungarian trade unions are proud of being in the vanguard of the great internal struggle, in the course of which was eliminated from Hungary's political life the enemies of the People's Democracy, of the workers and of the country.”

On October 14 the Hungarian regime received the guarantee of its incumbency when *Rudé Pravo*, organ of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, was quoted at length over the Prague radio as saying in part: “We shall assure political, cultural and citizens' rights to Hungarians. . . . The people of Czechoslovakia may rest assured that chauvinism will never be revived in Hungary. In Hungary the Progressive forces have come to power.”

That evening Moscow's European service, broadcasting in Serbo-Croat, defended the Hungarian regime against the “chauvinism” exhibited by Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia.

In Budapest on October 15, Eric Geroe, Hungarian

Minister of Communications said: "We strive to adapt the economic science of Marx, Engels and Stalin and Lenin to specific Hungarian conditions." Later in the month, theory disappeared and the smear began. On the Budapest radio there was a summary of the Hungarian Trade Union Council's convention. Mihaly Horvath, organizational secretary, told a prepared union group:

The Congress declared in the name of 1,600,000 organized workers that it is for complete freedom of worship and freedom for the churches, but it urges the Government, and indeed demands of it, that it put an end to the anti-democratic machinations of Jozsef Mindszenty, the present Cardinal.

On October 26, the Democratic Women's World Federation, "representing 100 million women," came to Budapest. Among the fragrant flowers who "represented" the women of their countries were "Nina Porkov, a member of the Supreme Soviet . . . La Pasionaria, the great Spanish republican leader . . . Ana Pauker, Rumanian Foreign Minister." It is not hard to guess what these representative women from "thirty-five" nations were told about the Cardinal for home consumption.

Two days later, Premier Dinnyes, addressing the Smallholders Conference, stated:

We take particularly into account the relationship of the dependency between certain Hungarian Catholic circles and big American capital, but we cannot tolerate the forcing into the same dependency of the Hungarian masses, desirous of following their religious convictions and not the agents of imperialism. . . . We shall remain unflinchingly aligned with our powerful Soviet friend.

The attack shifts. Now the radio stations in Budapest strike from another angle: the example of the "cooperation" of Protestant Churches as contrasted with the intransigence of the Catholic Church. (By this time one Lutheran bishop had been jailed.)

Broadcasting in English to the world, radio Budapest stated:

In the course of the Protestant Week in Hungary, a meeting took place in the great hall of the Academy of Music in Budapest to celebrate the Reformation. The leaders of the Protestant churches were there to hear Bishop Albert Bereczky make a speech. Speaking in general terms of Cardinal Mindszenty, the bishop said there were people today who tried, some by abuse, some by ingratiating, to draw the Protestant churches into a political struggle.

Bishop Bereczky is then quoted as follows:

We Protestants want to serve our people by the healing and constructive power of the Gospel, but if anyone were to thwart us in this constructive work and in serving the Gospel for worldly ends, we will, despite their abuse, lies and accusations, say: Hands off the teachings of the Gospel, even if those hands have a Cardinal's ring on them.

The forces were being lined up. On November 13 the Hungarian domestic radio reported: "The fifth national Army Conference of the Hungarian Workers' Party began today in the Honved House." Mihaly Farkas, Minister of Defense, touched upon "the reactionary clandestine activities of Cardinal Mindszenty and his associates." He pointed out that the broad strata of the Hungarian population have had "enough of the political incitement

hiding behind the cloak of the Church." "I am convinced," said Farkas, "that the Government, to satisfy the protests which come from all strata of Hungarian workers, will not wait long to grant these just demands."

On November 15 the same station reported that "the trade union leaders at the meeting took a stand against the anti-nationalist activities of Cardinal Mindszenty, demanding the Government to forbid the activities of clerical reaction. At a meeting of the administrative committee of the Budapest municipality, on behalf of the Peasant Party, János Keri condemned the anti-democratic attitude of Mindszenty." He stated that "Mindszenty is not a bishop any more but the arch-politician of reaction, the sole commander-in-chief of every reactionary, anti-revolutionary and fascist force. Mindszenty wants war because he hopes for political and economic restoration from it."

The pace and the pitch are increasing. On November 20 the Budapest radio quoted from an article in *Haladás*, entitled "The Clergy's Declaration of War":

It could have been predicted without any prophetic foresight that there would come within a short time a decisive battle between the Hungarian Catholic hierarchy and the Hungarian State. In the irresponsible cultural struggle initiated by the clergy, it is the duty of the State to protect the new order against any disturbing attempts. According to indications, the Government will soon abandon its restraint and avert the attack with effective defenses.

That same day another periodical, *Igaz Szo* (Fighters for Freedom), stated:

In letters and telegrams, resolutions and proposals, the whole country is protesting against the incitement, the focal point of which is the residence of the Cardinal of Estergom, and whose hedgehog position can be found duplicated in the see of every bishop. The working people will not tolerate that their work should be undermined by others.

Each Sunday Cardinal Mindszenty has lowered the pulpit to the level of a soap-box and incited and instigated against everything which is in the interest of the people and, not in the last place, of the Catholics themselves. The soap-box, however, is distasteful to the Hungarian people. Let everybody be sure that we will have the strength to force the present chief agent of American imperialism in Hungary down from the soap-box.

The following day (November 21) Sandor Barcs, Vice-President of the Smallholders Party, told his listeners that the opposition (Barankovics Party) have members who . . . are mostly covertly, but often openly, visiting one village after another as the agents of Cardinal Mindszenty. We cannot tolerate that civil rights should be granted to such people, who are attempting, not as an opposition but as a raging Mindszentyite enemy, to mislead, to incite the Hungarian peasants, and to hoodwink them against their own interests. The Hungarian Workers Party was the next to hear about the "iniquities" of the Cardinal. Matyas Rakosi, Deputy Premier, real leader of the communist tyranny and long a friend of Joseph Stalin, told the group during a long speech a day later:

The Comrades know that we have succeeded in reaching an agreement with the Protestant churches.

Through mutual concessions and understanding we regulated these Church relations to the State. To our greatest regret, we have hitherto been unable to reach a similar agreement with the Roman Catholic Church, but not because Hungarian democracy did not try to!

On the contrary, reproach is being leveled against us by the Protestant Church for excessive patience, and the enemies of democracy in the Church have exploited this patience, which they have interpreted as a sign of weakness. . . . Now we are hearing similar voices from the Catholic side, too. The movement, which from thousands of villages and organizations now spontaneously demands a change in our policy toward the Catholic Church reactionaries, is a warning which must be heeded. . . . The religious-minded workers, and above all the peasants, begin to realize that reaction was exploiting their religious feelings.

Rakosi next repeated the old charges of the "cassock or the Cardinal's cloak" hiding Fascists. Then, holding up a government agreement with the small Protestant groups, he said:

It is thus incompatible that an organized troop of reaction like that lining up behind Mindszenty should disturb our reconstruction and stabilization. . . . The fact that we were able to come to an agreement with the Protestant churches and that with Mindszenty we were not, makes all well-meaning people realize that the question here is not one of persecuting religion but a justified and inevitable self-defense of democracy. This change of policy will be even better understood by those many thousands of Catholic democrats who demanded that they should be protected against the excesses of reaction in an ecclesiastical cloak.

The same day the Bratislava radio in Czechoslovakia threw its piece of silver upon the scale with a searing attack upon all the bishops of Central Europe. On Nov. 28 *Fueggetelen Magyarorszag* announced that the "Young Catholics" in the county of Czanad "have asked the bishop of the county not to have Mindszenty's political letter read in the churches."

On December 6, the Budapest radio carried another attack. In this, the Cardinal ceased to be an individual and became a symbol. The protests eliminated the man and dwelt on "Mindszentism." The same broadcast praised the National Federation of Landowners for "demanding the liquidation of Mindszentism and the elimination of Mindszenty from public life."

Eight days later the new Hungarian Premier, addressing the legislature, reviewed the charges of the previous weeks, and at great length. Concluding, he said:

The Government is receiving by the thousand telegrams and letters, many of them from Catholic priests, Catholic congregations and Catholic professors and students in universities, in which the demand is put forward to take strong action against Mindszenty. In this respect, the will of the people cannot be disregarded.

The "clamor" grew. On December 17 it was reported that "nine leading Catholics" had written to Cardinal Mindszenty and said, in part:

As a result of your attitude, the Hungarian Catholic Church has in the past years become an illegal political party under the cover of which the forces of

counter-revolution are gathering. Your Eminence has split the spiritual unity of the working Catholic masses who remain loyal to their faith. . . .

On December 19, Deputy Laszlo Orban of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers Party told 1,500 lawyers in Budapest:

It is indispensable that Marxism-Leninism should permeate our legal practice. The legislature and the jurisdiction of the USSR must be studied more thoroughly than hitherto because the USSR is juridically the most advanced state in the world.

On December 27 the press department of the Ministry of the Interior reported that the police authorities

. . . have taken into custody Jozsef Mindszenty, Archbishop of Esztergom, under suspicion of high treason, crimes aimed at the overthrow of the Republic, espionage and illegal dealings in foreign exchange.

The broadcast was in Hungarian. Later it was repeated in Serbo-Croat. Then, broadcasting in English to all the world, the Budapest radio cited the Archbishop Laud case in 1640 in England and stated that Mindszenty, like Laud, had worked with "Jesuits and papists, bishops and that corrupt part of the clergy. . . ." It continued: "Every word that stands against Laud stands in triple measure against Mindszenty in Hungary today. The English people beheaded Archbishop Laud. Why do their rulers now protest at the arrest of a man who did much worse?"

That same day the Czech radio in Prague supported the stand of a group, citing "letters" from Catholic priests demanding ". . . the speedy expulsion of the Roman Catholic priests who . . . are . . . undermining our regime and causing unrest. . . . We are awaiting a reply from the bishops."

The pattern was complete. On December 29, two days after the arrest of the Cardinal had been announced, "telegrams" from small towns began "to pour in," praising the Government's "energetic measure" in putting an end to the "criminal activities of Jozsef Mindszenty. . . ." The next day it was announced on the radio that delegations of workers and peasants came "in long lines" to praise the Premier for acting against the Cardinal.

On New Year's Day, with the Cardinal somewhere in a cell, President Szakasits announced: "The Hungarian Government and the Hungarian people have no other object . . . than to return the Roman Catholic Church to its original vocation." Two hours later, in an English broadcast, U.S. Under Secretary of State Robert Lovett was attacked. The following afternoon it was announced in both Hungarian and English that "more and more" priests are "taking a stand against Mindszenty." On January 4, usual news programs were dropped to make place for long, detailed statements against the Cardinal. And on January 5 he was called "the greatest enemy the Hungarian people have ever had."

Meanwhile, the frame is being set for the next picture. Perhaps a "rising tide of public resentment" will take place. Perhaps the Government will have to "save" the Church from its betrayers.

Twenty easy lessons in how to jail a Cardinal. Twenty easy lessons in the lexicon of hell.

Literature & Art

Little feathered arrows

Robert R. Boyle

Philosophers, like busy little beavers, have at times attempted to dam the flow of artistic production, to flood their own theories at the expense of free artistic activity. So Father Louis Doyle had good plump game available for his piercing arrows, lavishly propelled in his witty *D-Day for Ariel* (AM., 12/18/48). It is too bad that he aimed a few of his shafts at the work of a philosopher who rather deepens the channel than dams the stream. I come, like a harassed game warden, to protest and to attempt to explain why such shooting is illicit. It is obviously ineffective.

In the article, after a couple of astonishing remarks about Aristotle's conclusions and Scholasticism's achievement, Maritain's *Art and Scholasticism* becomes the target for a sheaf of bolts. The book, "which is the most valiant attempt to date to construct a Catholic esthetic, is a valiant failure." Maritain, more modest in his estimate of the book's aim, proposes merely to indicate a few of the main features of a theory of art based on the wisdom of antiquity. To call Maritain's book a failure, albeit a "valiant" one, is to say that it fails in what it set out to do. I fear the author attacks the book for failing to do what it never intended to do.

We read, in Father Doyle's article, that when "advances are made in art, they are made by artists, not by reason of abstract thinkers." It is not clear here whether "art" refers to the actual exercise of the habit of art or to the products which result. Taken either way, the statement is certainly true. Those abstract thinkers who lay down univocal principles for the production of works of fine art are like the communist leaders who dictate to their scientists what they must say about the behavior of genes. Philosophers who attempt to dictate to artists as to the way their habit of art should be exercised deserve to receive an arrow in their midst. But—and this subtle distinction should be well noted—not all philosophers do that. And Maritain is one of those who don't. True, he philosophizes, at least in *Art and Scholasticism*, but he knows better than to try to substitute univocal universal principles for the free activity of an artist in producing fine art. In fact, Maritain shows clearly and at great length precisely why such a substitution is impossible.

"Most artists," the article goes on, "have been too busy creating things of beauty to tell us how it is done." It may be that those artists just didn't know exactly how they did it. At any rate, telling how the work is made is not the function of the artist. He is concerned only with

the making. When he stops to tell you the ultimate *how* and *what*, he becomes a philosopher, or attempts to do so. And an artist, while he can be a philosopher, need not be a philosopher in order to be a good artist. Neither need a philosopher be an artist in order to philosophize well about art and its products.

Another shaft fluttering toward Maritain's volume informs us that Maritain "shouldered the burden of binding art so closely to Catholic philosophy and theology as to leave it practically no independent existence." A difficulty here and throughout the article—a difficulty, by the way, which one might learn from Maritain and other good philosophers to avoid—is the ambiguity of the term "art." In the very paragraph in which the above sentence appears, "art" is used in two quite different senses. It is used without qualification for the habit of art that exists in the intelligence and for the works which result from the activity of the artist. Here I should say the term is intended to refer to *the habit of art in the intellect*, for to speak of binding the sciences of philosophy and theology to works of art is patently absurd.

But what can it mean to say that philosophy and theology threaten the independent existence of the habit of art? If the habit of art exists at all, its prime function is to judge what is and what is not for the good of the work. If that judgment is destroyed, the habit of art is destroyed. It can't exist at all dependent on anything else, if one means by such dependence that the judgment of the habit of art is destroyed. So to say that art, after Maritain's treatment, has practically no independent existence, is to say that Maritain practically destroys art. The statement should be proved, and particularly interesting in the proof would be the demonstration of Maritain's achieving this destruction by means of the strangling grip of philosophy and theology. I fear that this arrow must fall to the ground for lack of a target.

As a matter of fact, Maritain's distinction between works of useful art and works of fine art, if it is understood, shows clearly that philosophy and theology cannot dictate the judgment of the artist as such. Those sciences are helpless to dictate what will be good for the work which is ordered to a further end, as is a work of useful art. A ship, for example, is made to carry things on water, not to be contemplated in itself, though one may contemplate it. But it is essentially ordered to further use, and its nature is determined by that end. As C. S. Lewis points out in *Out of the Silent Planet*, a boat will be essentially the same whether made on Earth or on Mars, since the end is the same in both cases. We can discover and use univocally certain universal principles, deducing them from the nature of a ship and applying them in the building of ships. Theology and philosophy, bind them as closely to art as you will, will not be able

to affect the judgment of the useful artist or to dictate the principles which will apply to his work.

An attempt to peer into the nature of a work of fine art is made difficult by a profound problem, acutely stated and solved by Maritain. A work of useful art is determined by univocal universal rules drawn from the end to which the work is ordered; but a work of fine art cannot be determined by its end, which is simply to be beautiful. Beauty is a transcendental which shares the infinity of being. Things can be beautiful in an infinite number of ways. There is therefore nothing in the end of a work of fine art to determine it to any particular way, as there is in the case of a work of useful art. For that reason you cannot find any univocal universal rules which you can lay down beforehand to guide the artist. In so far as the work is material, there will of course be rules which will apply generally: the techniques of applying paint, carving wood, grouping vowels and consonants, etc.

But in so far as the work is beautiful, there are no universal univocal rules. Universal principles derived from a work ordered to beauty will be the same only when considered *formally* and *analogically*, as Maritain explains, since they are principles pertaining to a transcendental, not, as in the useful arts, to a particular activity. Therefore only the intellect of the artist—and this is the creative factor in producing a work of fine art—under the impetus of his own previous vision of the beautiful, will determine the work in regard to its own peculiar and unique demands. Theology and philosophy, again, cannot influence this judgment of the artist, since the sole consideration of the artist as artist is the good of the work.

But if theology and philosophy cannot smother the artist, perhaps another habit, the virtue of prudence, can. Father King, as quoted in the article, says: "Art and prudence, *factibile* and *agibile*; to distinguish these, and in his life and activity to join them in a lasting wedlock—there is his business." Father Doyle appears to understand these words as referring to the "*modus operandi* of the artist in expressing the Word." However, Father King's intention is to distinguish between the activity of the artist as artist and the activity of the artist as man—between art and prudence.

Both art and prudence, as Maritain following St. Thomas shows, have three acts: 1) *counsel*, or the finding of means; 2) *judgment* of the means found; 3) *command*, which consists in the application of counsel and judgment to operation. The perfection of art is found in *judgment*, the perfection of prudence in *command*. The artist remains a good artist if he can judge what is for the good of his work, even if he deliberately makes very faulty works or makes no works at all. But the man is imprudent if he deliberately does bad acts or refrains from doing necessary good acts, even though he judges perfectly what acts will lead him to his final end.

The habit of art is supreme in determining the means to attain the good of the work, and the habit of prudence is supreme in commanding the means to attain the good of the man. Prudence cannot dictate to art what the judg-

ment of art will be in regard to the good of a work; art therefore has nothing to do with morality, which is the domain of prudence. But prudence will be alert to see whether the command of art, the executing of its judgment, is for the good of the artist as man. If it is not, if for example the work would cause spiritual harm to the artist or to other men, prudence will prevent the *command* of art. Thus the philosopher clarifies a problem which has caused and I suppose will cause innumerable skirmishes among literary men. The philosopher's distinction between art and prudence will not enable a poet to write a better poem. It doesn't *fail* to do that; it just doesn't do it. But when understood, it will enable the poet to see that his *judgment* as artist, the perfection of his habit of art, is independent of morality, but his *command* as artist is under the authority of prudence.

Yet another critical arrow proclaims that Maritain "extended the field of poetry to include all of art." It seems to me that the writer fails to note that Maritain uses "poetry" in the Aristotelian sense of "a making." Maritain uses "art" to signify the intellectual habit, "poetry" to signify the products of art. Perhaps Father Doyle wishes to apply a principle which he used in his "To M'sieu Jourdain" (AM., 9/18/48), where he attempted to determine the meaning of "buckle" in Hopkins's "The Windhover" by using "the commonest current meaning of the word." However, in philosophy, as in poetry, the commonest current meaning of a word is not always the one which the author intends; if it were, the dictionaries would be wasting lots of print. And as it is not difficult to determine that "buckle," in a context containing words like "minion," "dauphin," "chevalier," "sillion," and referring throughout to a picture of knightly valor, should be taken in a knightly sense, so it should not be difficult for one reading *Art and Poetry* to perceive that "poetry" is used in its root sense.

Maritain's great work will not, assuredly, be endangered by any such haphazard flight of arrows as that which we have been considering. But perhaps this sketchy indication of a few of Maritain's principal theses will help those hungry sheep of whom Father Doyle speaks to find the food which they seek. As Father Doyle says, what he wants is "far more explicit guidance in the practical problems of this difficult matter, even perhaps to dashing off a wee bit masterpiece now and then as a 'See what I mean?' . . ." He really shouldn't bend the bow of accusation at Maritain, though, because Maritain fails to give such practical aid. Maritain doesn't *fail* to do it; he just doesn't do it. He's a philosopher, and *Art and Scholasticism* is an inquiry into the ultimate causes of a work of art. The book will help not at all in knowing how to write a poem. One must certainly go to the artists to learn the techniques and the practical workings of the artist's mind, to seek help in developing the habit of art. One must seek out the philosopher, however, to receive help in discovering the nature of the habit of art and its products, and no philosopher, I believe, has probed more deeply and more successfully into this obscure matter, even in what he himself calls a merely introductory study, than has Maritain.

Books

How satellites grow

THE STRUGGLE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

By Ferenc Nagy. Translated from the Hungarian by Stephen K. Swift. Macmillan. 471p. \$6

THE WAR WE LOST: Yugoslavia's Tragedy and the Failure of the West

By Constantine Fotitch. Viking. 344p. \$3.50

When the Russians occupied Hungary, Mr. Nagy, a prominent leader of the farmers' Smallholders Party of his country, thought that as a representative of the peasant class he would be in a position to work with the Soviets. This book, a first-hand and dynamic account of his awakening, could not fail to be a story of unbridled communism at its worst.

Ferenc Nagy was not one of those capitalists or big industrialists who would naturally be unacceptable to the victory-drunk Russians. Of sturdy Hungarian peasant stock, he had risen to a position of national and international importance by advancing the cause of the common man against the tides of totalitarianism of all kinds. As Prime Minister of a defeated country, Mr. Nagy had attempted to stem the Soviet flood, had fought at each step the deliberate political and economic penetration of the Soviet agents, all schooled in the academies of the Comintern in Moscow. But neither his good will nor his sturdy resistance availed.

When the Comrades took over, the land reforms, for which all progressive Hungarians had been fighting for the past few generations, were quickly exploited for the purpose of imposing the communist dictatorship. Extinction of the defenders of freedom in Hungary followed.

The author, although Premier, was helpless to prevent the kidnappings and arrests of Hungarian patriots, among them his beloved friend and leader of the Smallholders Party, Bela Kovacs. Arrested on trumped-up charges, Bela Kovacs made "confessions" implicating not only several perfectly innocent Hungarians but the Premier himself as well. Mr. Nagy was induced to resign in return for the promise of safety for his five-year-old son. Subsequently he found refuge in the United States, settling on a farm in Virginia.

Mr. Constantine Fotitch's book, *The War We Lost*, deals with the Yugoslav

tragedy and the failure of the West to prevent that country from becoming a communist puppet under Broz-Tito. The inconsistency of American policy, the author charges, has cost the lives of thousands of his countrymen and, indeed, it has cost Eastern and Central Europe their freedom.

Mr. Fotitch, a Serbian nationalist, finds no kind word for the Croats, especially for the Croat leaders who cast their lot with the Germans and Italians in the unfounded hope that an Axis victory would bring about the establishment of an independent Croat state. On the subject of Serbo-Croatian relations, the author fails to give the background of the fratricidal strife which dates back much beyond the existence of Hitler and Mussolini; and his book can be expected to evoke bitter protest from the Croats and those who support the cause of Croatian freedom.



The central figure of Mr. Fotitch's account is General Drazha Mihailovich, the Chetnik leader who began his guerrilla warfare against the Germans immediately after their occupation of Yugoslavia. At the beginning, the British and Americans had welcomed Mihailovich; later, on the insistence of pro-Soviet elements, this support was suddenly withdrawn and all help given to a Croatian Communist, Josef Broz, known today as Marshal Tito. For the Allied switch toward Tito, Mr. Fotitch puts more blame upon Winston Churchill than upon the late President Roosevelt. He believes that Churchill tacitly agreed to the "spheres of influence" in the Balkans all along.

The impartial observer who knows little of Balkan problems would not readily understand the basic reason for the British shift from Mihailovich to Tito. Was it because British observers were not impressed with the military prowess of the hardy Chetniks? Or did the Allies decide to back Tito in order to please their great ally, Stalin? It appears the latter is pretty much the case. If so, the Allies did more to establish communism in Yugoslavia than Russia itself. WALTER DUSHNYCK

The official line

THE ECONOMY OF THE USSR DURING WORLD WAR II

By Nikolai A. Voznesensky. Public Affairs Press. 115p. \$3

Dictatorships maintain themselves in power by force, the lavish use of falsehood, truth-twisting and tub-thumping to arouse patriotic fervor against non-existent danger from abroad. Nikolai A. Voznesensky, the Soviet Deputy Premier and chairman of the Soviet Planning Commission, ties all four methods into a neat bundle in this book, which purports to reveal how the communist economy functioned under the impact of war and to explain Russian plans for domestic rehabilitation and for participation in the postwar international economy.

The book was originally issued by an official Soviet publishing house, and the translation brought out here is under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, to which gratitude is due for its recognition of the study's great value.

It is doubtful that the statistics supplied here can be accepted as completely valid. Following the usual Soviet custom, statistical revelations are used to produce an effect or to score a point, and are rarely either wholly truthful or completely frank. For instance, nowhere does Mr. Voznesensky mention the enormous slave economy of the Russian forced-labor camps, although observers such as David Dallin tell us that there are approximately fifteen million slaves laboring for the Soviet state who are unpaid and, in fact, barely fed. Nor does Mr. Voznesensky bother to tell us of the effect on the internal Russian economy of such transformations as the destruction of whole states and peoples and the transference of others into the Asian wilderness. This was the fate of the Tartar and other autonomous Soviet Republics whose people, on the accusation that some of them collaborated with the German occupation forces, were uprooted and driven far from their homes.

The study is chiefly valuable for the information it furnishes on the official Soviet attitude toward us. We have known for some time, of course, that the Russians and their friends represent "democracy," and that we are imperialists seeking to dominate the world in the interest of international financiers and large-scale capitalists. Voznesensky repeats this, and adds that there never can be a complete settlement between his system and ours, that war is inevitable and can be prevented only if this country is rendered militarily and economically powerless. Britain, despite its socialist Government, he links with the United States as capi-

talist, and therefore a member of the anti-democratic camp.

Our endeavor to restore international self-sufficiency with the Marshall plan he naturally terms economic slavery. But such perversions of the truth are not surprising from a man who calls the war against Germany single combat for the Soviet forces. Nowhere in his study does Voznesensky have the grace to acknowledge the huge American and the smaller but still valuable British contribution to the Soviet war economy. There is no acknowledgment of the billions in supplies and equipment furnished by lend-lease, just as there is no acknowledgment of the great part our own and other Allied forces played in the defeat of Germany.

Like all Russian books, the text is full of sickening adulation of Stalin—"Great Stalin," as he is termed—and is rich in that peculiar Russian method of historiography which enables an author to forget about facts which offer no comfort to the Kremlin and to invent "facts," as they are needed, to throw better light on communism and its heroes. But since it prints the official Russian line, and since we could have avoided many of the past ten years' woes had we believed that Hitler would really follow the program outlined in *Mein Kampf*, a thorough study of Mr. Voznesensky's book should be very rewarding to policy-making government officials and students of our international relations.

LEONARD J. SCHWEITZER

Irishman without priest

YEATS: THE MAN AND THE MASKS

By Richard Ellman. Macmillan. 295p. \$5

It is difficult to do justice to the subtle and careful complexities of this new study of Yeats, easily the best that has appeared. The author has had the advantage of being able to consult in Dublin some 50,000 pages of unpublished manuscripts of Yeats, including some autobiographical notes, drafts of poems, letters, diaries and other papers. Instead of being overwhelmed by their abundance, he has made good use of them. The portrait that emerges is full of lights and shades; there is no oversimplification and, on the other hand, neither are the main outlines blurred by a welter of unrelated details.

It would seem obvious that the chief materials for any study of Yeats would be his own autobiographical writings. Mr. Ellman, however, goes about his job cautiously and is wise enough to know that Yeats' autobiographical muse enticed him only to betray him. Throughout his *Autobiographies* there is, for instance, his tendency to construct myths. On the basis of having

once learned the Hebrew alphabet and a few Hebrew words, he would say "I have forgotten my Hebrew" with an air of solemnity. He posed and attitudinized, then wondered whether pose and attitude were not more real than what they covered. At other times he yielded to the temptation of adopting convenient simplifications and pretending that they left nothing out. All this makes the task of the biographer of Yeats a particularly difficult one, and it makes Mr. Ellman's book an impressive performance.

In a sense, the unifying factor in Yeats' life and art was his search for a faith, a religion. This search is implicit—and more forcefully presented just because it is not stated too overtly—throughout Ellman's study. He sees Yeats' first effort to find himself as a rebellion against the materialism and skepticism of his father, John Butler Yeats, the painter. Probably Yeats never completely freed himself from his father's skepticism, for he remained deeply affected by it, and yet his rebellion carried him in strange directions. He ended by making a new religion of poetic tradition, a fardel of folk stories, occultism and dreams and, finally, of a symbolism in which the division between dream and reality was so tenuous that Yeats himself made the two interchangeable. He began by saying: "Whatever the great poets have affirmed in their finest moments is the nearest we can come to an authoritative religion"; he ended even more succinctly: "I make the truth." Symbolism becomes Yeats' method because it was a *modus vivendi* between skepticism and superstition.

Someone has said: "An Irishman cut adrift from his priest is exceedingly speculative." The search of Yeats—a man very much like Blake (Yeats liked to emphasize that Blake was Irish on his father's side)—stands as representative of the soul-dividing dilemma of the post-Renaissance artist who seeks to create both a new poetry and a new philosophy.

JOHN PICK

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF SOL BLOOM

Putnam. 331p. \$3.50

From errand boy in Figer Brothers' California brush factory to Chairman of the House of Representatives' Committee on Foreign Affairs—with time in between as ticket-seller, theatrical manager and speculator—Sol Bloom's life has been a varied and interesting one. Now, at seventy-eight, he has written his story—much of which is told in the fond, nostalgic mood of a candidate for the role of elder statesman.

For the most part, Mr. Bloom paints a roseate picture of life in San Fran-

"The book you must read if you want to know what Communism is.

"The master-key to the Russian enigma." . . . Saturday Review.

LENIN

A BIOGRAPHY

by David Shub

"One of the very few books of recent years absolutely indispensable to the student of contemporary history and of international relations, of Russia and of social revolution. At the same time, it is so full of historic drama, of incredible figures, of the Czar's secret police, of plots stranger than fiction, that it will fascinate the general reader."

PROF. HANS KOHN, N. Y. TIMES
BOOK REVIEW

"No other book with which I am familiar gives so clear a picture of Lenin's character and life."

WILLIAM C. BULLITT

"Mr. Shub's brilliant biography . . . must be read by everyone who wants to penetrate the minds and analyze the behavior of the men who created the most powerful and dangerous political machine in the world today."

THE CATHOLIC WORLD

"The author has succeeded remarkably well in presenting to the American reader a book which is something more than the biography of a dictator. . . . After reading Mr. Shub's LENIN, the Soviet tactics of Molotov, Vishinsky, and Gromyko in the United Nations are clearly understandable."

WALTER DUSHNYCK, AMERICA

Mr. Shub's biography of the Bolshevik leader should be read in its entirety. It is vividly instructive and salutary."

JOHN COUNOS, THE COMMONWEAL

"Profound, well-documented, and moving. Here is a volume that fulfills the oft made claim that it will interest both the general reader and the special student." . . . Cardinal Hayes Literature Committee. — THE BOOK SURVEY

"This is a book essential to every American's self-defense. Do not waste time and breath in talking about Communists until you have read LENIN: A Biography, and understand them."

ROSE WILDER LANE

At your bookseller. \$5.00

DOUBLEDAY & CO.
14 West 49th Street
New York, New York

cisco in the 'seventies and 'eighties. In 1876 he entered school, and left at the end of his first day. That was his one and only day of formal education—a fact which he explains by the statement that while the public schools of the day were free, the textbooks were not. Bloom's tributes to his poor, devoutly orthodox father and mother make genuinely inspirational reading. They were real people, and to the fundamentals which they instilled in him at an early age, Mr. Bloom rightly attributes much of his later success. Speaking of his mother, he says: "She taught me, in lieu of schooling, two great things. To read with understanding was the first. To desire to know was the second."

Congressman Bloom's life is the story of a man who has desired to know all types of people and all kinds of places. As a result of his remarkable zest for life, his autobiography is always a story of action; as the confidant of four Presidents and as the man who was chosen in 1945 to write the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, he reveals himself as a man who likes people and enjoys helping them solve their individual problems. Although at times his patriotic fervor may be a little on the exuberant side, Sol Bloom is undeniably an outstanding American.

This story is likewise the characteristic American story which never loses in

the re-telling; it should prove efficacious in these days when the hard-boiled, cynical attitude is much to the fore. Filled, as it is, with interesting anecdotes of the great and the near great, the Bloom *Autobiography* is an authentic human-interest story.

In his optimistic preview of tomorrow's better world, however, the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs goes awry. His "give the peoples of the earth enough to eat, and wars will cease" is hardly the ultimate panacea. Man needs more than a full belly to live in peace; he needs to vitalize his dormant social consciousness in the light of renewed moral and ethical responsibility. Surely Mr. Bloom must have read somewhere that "man does not live by bread alone."

EDWARD J. CLARKE

New Herder Publication

SECOND LATIN

by

CORA CARROLL SCANLON, A.M.

Milwaukee State Teachers College

and

CHARLES L. SCANLON, A.M.

Stephen F. Austin State College

\$3.50

THIS second-year Latin course is intended for students who can devote only two years to the study of Latin and who must be prepared to read intelligently Latin textbooks of philosophy, theology, and canon law. The vocabularies, word studies, exercises, and connected passages have been selected with this practical purpose in mind. The first half of the book is based on philosophical texts; the second half is drawn from works of theology and from the Code of Canon Law. A vocabulary of 3,000 words at the end of the volume serves the purpose of a concise dictionary.

This new course supposes the previous study of the authors' *Latin Grammar: Grammar, Vocabularies, and Exercises in Preparation for the Reading of the Missal and Breviary* (\$3.00), now in its fourth printing.

Order from your bookstore or from

B. HERDER BOOK COMPANY

15 & 17 South Broadway

St. Louis 2, Missouri

LAUGHTER IN THE NEXT ROOM

By Sir Osbert Sitwell. Little, Brown (An Atlantic Press Book). 390p. \$4

Although complete in itself, this is the fourth in a series of biographical and autobiographical sketches of the Sitwell family, with a promise of more to come "of a different kind from the others." The book is one for re-reading. A backward glance over certain passages is an esthetic thrill, and the content of others is truly a stimulating mental experience.

Paradoxical in effect, these essays of a definite continuity of thought are at once an offense against the Fourth Commandment and a filial appreciation. Problem parents are a very real bane to the literary efforts and actual living of the writer and his equally gifted brother and sister. The *pater familias* is the particular target of the verbal barbs but, as the story progresses, there is a softening of tone which, though possibly a bit patronizing, is much more tender.

A picture of life in England, politically and artistically, with some residence in Italy, between the two World Wars and up to the present, *Laughter in the Next Room*, with its picturesque title and its equally colorful sub-headings, is in turn gay, cheerful, subdued, pessimistic, but always thoughtful.

The writer has a flair for words; some descriptive passages are beautiful. As one delves deeper, there is a desire to find out what is coming next. Occasionally, the sentence structure is a bit breathless (the reader becomes breathless trying to reach the end of the sentence to see if it's structurally sound!). But it's all worth while; there is in the book a distinct element of humor.

Characterizations are excellent: the ever-watchful father who can't realize his children are grown up; the sweet and impractical mother who invites

twenty to luncheon sans preparation and sans warning to the servants—and promptly forgets all about it; the valet, Henry Moats. Although sister Edith and brother Sacheverell are less definitely drawn, the reader feels a certain intimacy with them. Scores of personages famous in contemporary British literature and other arts are discussed briefly or at length according to the author's knowledge of them.

In the last chapter the writer becomes prophetic as a character speaking across the chasm to the next inhabitants of the world after our time:

Those of my generation obtained an end to our world in 1914. We scarcely expected the second and more fatal. . . . Above all, my message is that the world could only have been saved—perhaps still can be—through the spirit of man, especially through art, its noblest and most important manifestation.

He neglected to mention God.

CATHERINE D. GAUSE

ALICE MEYNELL CENTENARY TRIBUTE

Edited by Terence L. Connolly, S.J.
Bruce Humphries. 72p. \$2.25

The centenary of the birth of Alice Meynell was marked last fall by an exhibition of manuscripts, letters and first editions in the Boston College Library. Father Terence L. Connolly, S.J., has now made an interesting and heart-enriching volume of the papers read at the symposium opening the observance on the evening of October 11, Mrs. Meynell's birthday. Added to the papers is a complete short-title list of Mrs. Meynell's works.

It was appropriate that the exhibit be held at Boston College, where during the past quarter-century the magnificent Thompson Collection has been assembled through the generosity of the Thompson Associates, the interest of the Meynells and the dedicated scholarship of Father Connolly.

The addresses of the symposium are sketches of Mrs. Meynell on four canvases. Mr. Robert Francis Wilberforce, C.B.E., recalls with affection and insight the Meynells in London and Rome. Miss Anne Kimball Tuell, professor of English at Wellesley College, eulogizes the mind of Alice Meynell: her deep culture that was the soil from which her writing sprang; the serene convictions that gave no place to bigotry; the manliness which made her no less feminine for being valiant; the marvelous energy that allowed her to rear eight children while pursuing a busy career in journalism.

The affinities between her own poems and Mrs. Meynell's give a special

charm to Sister Madeleva's appreciation. Her paper evokes "the essential Alice Meynell, the poet of the exact and exquisite word, of the elate and classical mood, of the metaphysics of beauty, of the restrained intensities of her every essential gift." Father Connolly, describing a few of the Meynell treasures that were spread through the Reception Room and the Great Hall of the Library, emphasizes the range and volume of Mrs. Meynell's work, and the conscious Christianity that was the law of her life.

Something of the faith and love and exquisite Catholic enthusiasm of the Meynells was caught by the audience that crowded the Library auditorium. In his remarks that closed the symposium, the Auxiliary Bishop of Boston spoke for lovers of Alice Meynell everywhere when he placed the meeting in its most appropriate frame of reference—the Catholic doctrine of the communion of saints. FRANCIS SWEENEY

THE DUKAYS

By Lajos Zilahy. Prentice-Hall. 795pp. \$3.50

This long, fairly interesting family chronicle belongs to a type more often found in European fiction than in English or American. It makes liberal use of the flux of history as background, without much more apparent purpose than a display of the author's virtuosity and his "inside" knowledge of the times. It is hard, therefore, to say whether a work such as this is written as a story or as a lively illustration of politics. Certainly, unless it be done with the skill and taste of the French, it is apt, as in the present case, to seem merely pretentious.

The Dukays are a noble Magyar family who have married and intermarried with the best names of Europe for centuries. The present family consists of Count Dupi, the father; Countess Menti, the mother; Rere, the eldest son, a half-wit; and Kristina, György, János and Terezia. Through some 800 pages the reader is given a realistic and often brutal picture of the lives of these children as lived against the background of history, from World War I up to the present day.

Through Kristina's diary we learn of the succession of Charles to the Austro-Hungarian throne, of his short reign, his exile, finally his death. The actual facts are there, but they are interspersed with fantasy, both political and historical. Then the story picks up with György, who is the student; and János, the personification of the fascist mind, a man who found the solution of his personal confusion in devotion to the

CANONICAL LEGISLATION CONCERNING RELIGIOUS

"THE present translation is intended for those Religious who cannot easily utilize the official Latin text of the Code of Canon Law. With the exception of certain canons, which exclusively concern clerical Institutes, it comprises practically the whole of the Second Part of the Second Book which treats of Religious, together with an appendix containing other canons drawn from other parts of the Code, and likewise referring to Religious.

This translation has been specially authorized by the Holy See."
—Foreword. \$.75



At your bookstore or from

NEWMAN PRESS

Catholic Publishers

WESTMINSTER

MARYLAND

HIDDEN FIELDS

A SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF MOTHER M. DEMETRIAS, FOUNDRESS AND FIRST SUPERIOR GENERAL OF THE MISSION HELPERS OF THE SACRED HEART.

by

Sister M. Rosalia, M.H.S.H.

The Mission Helpers of the Sacred Heart are a religious order established in Baltimore, Maryland in 1890. The order is devoted to catechetical work. This is the first published biography of the saintly Mother Demetrias. \$1.50



At your bookstore or from

NEWMAN PRESS

Catholic Publishers

WESTMINSTER, MARYLAND

HERE are the answers to current questions and objections about things Catholic as proposed by the average American. If your average American friend asks a question, hand him a Scott Pamphlet. Each one, itself a model of what intelligent discussion ought to be, is linked by logic to the series as a whole. Perhaps he'll think of another query or perhaps he'll just keep running into answers—answers written by the master religious pamphleteer.

THE FATHER SCOTT PAMPHLETS

1. **HAVE YOU A GOD?**
Proofs of existence of God
2. **PROVE THERE'S A SOUL**
The doctrine of immortality
3. **MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE, JOHN**
The Testament is the Word of God
4. **THEY SAID HE BLASPHEMED**
The Divinity of Christ
5. **HUNDREDS OF CHURCHES**
Catholic Church is the true Church
6. **SCIENCE HELPS THE CHURCH**
No conflict between science and revelation.
7. **NO POPE CAN BE WRONG**
Infallibility of the Pope
8. **THIS IS MY BODY**
The Sacrifice of the Mass
9. **GOD FORGIVES SINS**
The doctrine of the Confessional
10. **DIVORCE IS A DISEASE**
The marriage bond is indissoluble

Single Copy: 10¢ - Complete Set: \$1
Individual titles in bulk: \$7 per 100

THE AMERICA PRESS
70 E. 45th St., N. Y. C. 17

Please send me sets
Scott Pamphlets.
Send copies pamphlets
numbered
I enclose \$..... or ☐ Bill me.
Cash must accompany orders under \$1.

NAME.....
ADDRESS.....
CITY.....
STATE.....

nazi ideal and welcomed it to his country.

With Zia, as Terezia is called, we come to a study of the failure of a marriage, illustrated in considerable clinical detail. By this time history has moved on to the middle 'thirties and war is in sight. The book ends with the death of the father of this miscellaneous crew, a section of the book deriving much from the example of Colonel Newcome, Soames Forsyte and other well-known essays in the failure of pragmatic living.

The book is largely unsatisfactory. It is clever without being profound; it moves swiftly without having the capacity to move the reader. Unfortunately there is a certain amount of promiscuity mixed in here and there which appears to have no bearing on the purpose of the novel. The translation from the Hungarian is by John Pauker.

VIRGINIA HOPKINS

The Word

"LEPROSY," SAID JOE. HE SAID it as if he were saying "measles." "What's leprosy?"

I told him.

He looked at me with the detached interest of one for whom a word has no real meaning. But a shadow seemed to fall on Betty's face.

"I know," she said. "I saw a picture of a boy. His hands were all eaten away."

Joe looked down at his fingers as if he had never seen them before.

There was a silence.

Presently Joe spoke, slowly, tentatively. "He couldn't play baseball?"

"Baseball!" cried Betty; but I silenced the threatened outburst with a touch on her cheek.

"No," I said.

"I guess," said Joe, "he couldn't play games at all. Football... or ping-pong... or badminton."

Betty gestured impatiently, but I forestalled her again.

"Joe," I said gently, "the boy couldn't even wipe a tear from his eyes."

He looked at me, startled. Then he lowered his head and stared at his hands.

"The magazine had a story about the boy," said Betty. "The doctors are trying to make him well."

Suddenly, windows opened in my mind. I seemed to be looking into a vista of twenty centuries. Medical history telescoped before my eyes. I peered into laboratories, into hospitals, into clinics.

Two thousand years, I thought. Two thousand years, while our wisest men tried and tried to find a cure for one leper.

Words I had heard a hundred times times found a real home at last in my heart: "And behold a leper came and adored Him, saying, Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean. And Jesus, stretching forth His hand, touched him, saying, I will. Be thou made clean. And forthwith his leprosy was cleansed." Like that. Just like that. "Lord, if Thou wilt"...

"I will"...

And He stretched forth His hand. And touched him. That was all.

A furtive movement roused me from my reverie. Out of the corner of my eye, I saw Joe brushing away a tear.

"Poor kid," he said.

Betty spoke. "Do you think they'll ever learn to cure leprosy?" she asked.

I nodded. "Of course they will, if only..." I paused.

"If only what, Daddy?"

I answered slowly. "If only they keep on trying. If only they keep on loving lepers. If only they don't decide that it would be less trouble to kill them."

"Kill them!" Joe was standing, his fists clenched. "Kill that poor little kid?"

Watch your step, mercy-killers, I thought. Watch your step, murderers. This is the people speaking.

JOSEPH A. BREIG

Theatre

STAGE WISDOM. The six unreviewed books on my desk, mutely testifying to my talent for procrastination, suggest a query. Who reads all the books about the theatre that roll off the presses with persistent regularity? One can assume that the technical volumes, written by outstanding actors and directors, are eagerly scanned by members of the stage professions who are always looking for new ways to improve their respective arts. But who reads books like *Reference Point*, by Arthur Hopkins, a discussion of the stage crafts by an author who writes from long and distinguished experience as producer and director?

At a glance the volume appears to be too technical, or, rather, there is too much shop talk in it to be of interest to the general reader; while competent professionals are already familiar with its precepts. Each of the chapters was originally a lecture delivered at Fordham University, for the edification of students attending a Summer Theatre Seminar for drama teachers, directors

If the issue of Federal Aid to Education

interests you—

watch for

**Father William
E. McManus'**

vital discussion in

America's

Spring Term

EDUCATION

Number,

January 29th



EYE EXAMINATIONS—Three Registered Optometrists having years of experience are at your service, to give you examination and advice.

GLASSES at reasonable prices.
JOHN J. HOGAN, INC.

Established 1892
Louis Merckling and Staff, Optometrists
816 EAST 34TH STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.
(Opposite B. Altman's 34th Street Entrance)
Telephone: MU. 5-6774

AMERICA Subscribers

For change of address, three weeks' notice is required. When ordering a change, please name magazine and send us the old as well as the new address, including postal zone number, if you have one.

THE AMERICA PRESS
70 East 45th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

BROKEN JEWELRY WANTED

All kinds. Highest cash prices paid for jewelry, rings, spectacles, gold teeth, diamonds, broken and usable watches, etc. Cash mailed promptly. Write for FREE shipping container.

LOWE'S

Dept. A, Holland Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.

and undergraduates looking forward to a career in the theatre. The students who listened to the lectures, with an opportunity to ask questions before the class was dismissed, probably found the talks interesting, perhaps fascinating. Would the same students find the discourses equally interesting between covers? By its nature the question is one that must remain open, and perhaps it is better so.

Two classes of readers, however, will be grateful to Samuel French for publishing the rather thin volume of 135 pages, although the retail price, \$2.50, is a trifle stiff. The theatre has legions of camp followers who, although without either the talent or desire for a stage career, will clasp the volume to their bosoms as a small treasure of theatrical lore. It will also be relished by readers who respect good writing.

A third group that will welcome the book consists of readers who get a kick from encountering a challenging point of view, and a fourth includes the oldsters who cherish nostalgic memories of Harry Lauder and the Dockstader minstrels. Mr. Hopkins is an eclectic of the theatre arts, with vast and varied experiences back-stage and out front, and a memory longer than an elephant's. What he says is always sensible and frequently provocative.

After decades of work in the theatre, he has arrived at definite conclusions of the relative values of dramatists, actors and other theatrical craftsmen. His primary concern is for the integrity of the actor. "We have heard of actors who were made by directors," he says. "That," he comments, "is a miracle I have never witnessed." For paragons of acting excellence, he points to long forgotten vaudeville stars who were their own directors, mentioning McIntyre & Heath, Victor Moore, Charlie Case and Ed Blondell. There is a curious omission, Bert Williams.

The author has little to say on the importance of drama, but what he does say is significant. "The one human element that remains forever interesting," he declares, "is character." That, like virtually every other opinion in the book, is sound doctrine.

There are places where the reader may disagree with the author's opinions, but none where his principles can be questioned. He is humorous and tolerant, and while his book may not appeal to a wide audience it will be valued by those who appreciate clear thinking and fluent writing.

THEOPHILUS LEWIS

"America This Week," every Thursday evening, 7:15-7:30, on your radio—WFUV, 90.7 on the FM dial.

popular, modern

● **smartly-styled**

for eye appeal

Information

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN AMERICAN LIFE

1 year.... \$2

3 years... \$5

A monthly magazine published
by the PAULIST FATHERS

408 West 59 Street • New York 19 • N. Y.

**"Shocking
revelations of
deception and
treachery"**

—Cleveland News

THE
**RAPE OF
POLAND**
PATTERN OF
SOVIET AGGRESSION

by **STANISLAW
MIKOLAJCZYK**
Former Premier of Poland

Illustrated.
\$4.00 • at all bookstores
WHITTLESEY HOUSE

MOVIES

For Catholic Schools—Churches
A fine selection of 16mm sound films
Write for Free Catalog

SPECIAL

16mm sound projectors—demonstrators—full factory guarantee.

SUNRAY FILMS, INC.
2108 Payne Ave., Cleveland 14, Ohio

NOTICES

12c per word. Payment with order.

MISSIONARY PRIESTS struggling to build school; 140 Catholics in four counties of 140,000 population. PLEASE help us! Rev. Louis R. Williamson, Hartsville, South Carolina.

JESUIT HOME MISSION—My hope—a school to plant the Catholic tradition. Small contributions are precious and welcome. Rev. John A. Risacher, S.J., Holy Cross Mission, Durham, North Carolina.

IRISH Books, Belleek China, Linens, Celtic Crosses, Rosaries, Cards, etc. Write for Catalogue. Irish Industries Depot, Inc., 876 Lexington Ave., New York 21, N. Y.

Films

Melodramas form such a numerically large part of the screen's yearly output that they tend to jam up the workings of a column. To relieve the stoppage temporarily I would like to deal with the current mixtum-gatherum at one sitting.

THE ACCUSED. Though this definitely adult thriller about a woman's conscience is effective and considerably more intelligent than the average run, I found it quite disturbing. The story tells of a spinsterish, young psychology professor (Loretta Young) who quite innocently gets herself into a situation with a problem student from which she can only extricate herself by striking in self-defense. When she finds that she has indeed killed the young man and realizes that, however much legal justification she has, the revelation of her act will ruin her reputation and her chosen career, she tries to conceal it by arranging the scene to look like an accident. The rest is a battle between her intelligence and psychological training, alerted to prevent self-betrayal, on one hand, and her conscience and a detective (Wendell Corey, who knows a thing or two about human

nature himself), on the other, with the dead boy's guardian (Robert Cummings) who has fallen in love with the harassed young woman, caught in the crossfire. Eventually of course she is found out. By that time, however, the picture is more interested in working out a happy ending than in resolving any of its complex moral issues and the only thing it indicates positively is that in case of serious trouble your best hope lies in being loved by a good lawyer. (Paramount)

THE DARK PAST is also about a psychology professor. In this case he is Lee J. Cobb and he is undertaking to psychoanalyze a multiple murderer (William Holden) under extraordinary circumstances. The setting is the professor's summer home (designed incidentally on an incongruously lavish scale) where a house party is interrupted by an escaping convict and his gang who take refuge at the point of a gun. For a while the picture toys with exploring the reactions of a cross-section of humanity under stress, but finally settles down to having the professor demonstrate the ascendancy of moral integrity over brute force by laying bare the roots of his captor's criminal tendencies. By the time the police arrive the latter has been effectively disarmed by Freud. Adults should find this a fairly typical example of the screen's capsule psychiatry, a little

more lucid than some and better acted but basically not a bit more convincing. (Columbia)

FORCE OF EVIL. I had a little trouble following this account of a falling-out among "numbers" racketeers, perhaps because I possessed wofully little prior knowledge of the subject or perhaps because the dialog was of the Clifford Odets school of poetic realism and was more artistic than intelligible. Despite this considerable drawback, adults should find the movie several cuts above the usual gangster film. It's the story of two brothers (John Garfield and Thomas Gomez), variously involved in the racket, who learn the hard way—when a mobster with mass-production methods decides to take over—that it is impossible to be just a little dishonest. If it grounded in recognizable human failings rather than in dog-eat-dog gunplay. As a result, the feeling of repugnance for its "force of evil" is no mere crime-does-not pay appendage but is implicit in character and situation. (MGM)

To round out the record, **WHIPLASH** (Warner) is a triangle featuring a prize fighter (Dane Clark), a lady (Alexis Smith) and her thoroughly obnoxious husband (Zachary Scott), which is resolved to the accompaniment of much violence in and out of the ring, with no discernible regard for either credibility or moral principle.

MOIRA WALSH

School of ADULT Education (co-educational)

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

CITY HALL DIVISION (DUANE & BROADWAY)
NEW YORK 7, N. Y.

OFFERS

the following courses beginning January 31, 1949:

Historical Novels

Mr. Joseph Hopkins
Wednesday Evening

Irish Art and Culture

Mr. Collins Healy
Monday Evening

Basis of the Humanities

Mr. William Grace
Friday Evening

Public Speaking

Dr. George Glasgow
Wednesday Evening

Other Courses include:

Propaganda Methods, Beginners' Problems in Philosophy, Effective Thinking,
Major Issues in Ethics, Speaking Spanish: Intermediate

Fee for each course is \$15.00—Courses begin January 31, 1949

Registration: January 24, 25, 26; 3 to 6 P. M. (Room 308)

Courses may be taken for college credit.

For further information write or telephone, School of Adult Education, Fordham University, 302 Broadway, New York 7, New York, BArcley 7-1366.

Parade

SOMEWHAT LIKE A BASEBALL pitcher experimenting with new types of curves, current history tossed up a week-long barrage of queer-seeming events. . . . Zipping across life's home plate, the events exploded with every conceivable type of twist. . . . The odd twists twined around the judiciary. . . . In Harlan, Ky., a judge fined himself ten dollars for appearing in court intoxicated. . . . Into the domestic milieu the twists wormed their way. . . . In Denmark, a man cut off his dog's tail because the animal wagged it every time the man's mother-in-law showed up. . . . From the midst of wintry storms also rose freakish behavior patterns. . . . In Iowa, a citizen on a snow plow was arrested for drunken driving. . . . Into prisons filtered the trend. . . . In the Jefferson City, Mo., penitentiary, a convict trusty conducted a service, preached to his fellow-prisoners, saying: "I go to prepare a place for thee—and where I go ye shall also

SPECIAL FOR ENGLISH TEACHERS

If you teach English or Literature classes

Try AMERICA's Literature section next term as a definite part of your class program. Every week AMERICA features a short, interesting article on literature: on authors, books, critics, censorship, literary movements here and abroad. These are always scholarly, always vital and readable.

Then, AMERICA reviews the really worthwhile books of current importance from biography and fiction to political science and poetry. Written on the principles as set down by Harold C. Gardiner, S.J., literary editor and author of *Tenets for Readers*, each by an expert in the field of its subject, these reviews not only give succinct and interesting evaluations of books from the Catholic viewpoint, but are themselves examples of literary criticism. You'd find AMERICA useful.

SPECIAL FOR HISTORY TEACHERS

If you teach Economics or Modern History classes

Discover, this next term, how easy it is to use AMERICA as a supplementary textbook. And how practical. You will find in AMERICA every week, the Washington Front and Comment; week after week, editorials and articles on such things as the Marshall plan, population problems, the courts, congressional action, prices and the economic outlook, aid to Europe, Cooperatives, labor disputes, and reports from correspondents in Germany, France, Italy, even Russia and the Balkans. With regard to any current event or any occurrence having a bearing on current conditions, AMERICA supplies the latest details, evaluates the multiple and complex versions of the news, brings you and your students the all important Catholic viewpoint.

HERE'S HOW AMERICA'S EASY SCHOOL PLAN WORKS

Each student copy costs only 10c (regularly 15c). You may raise or lower the number of copies whenever you wish; cancel entirely during holidays, exams, etc. We will send, at no extra charge, one instructor's copy with every ten student copies and to simplify your task, we bill you monthly.

USE
AMERICA
IN
YOUR
CLASSROOM

The AMERICA PRESS

70 East 45th Street, New York 17, New York

In accordance with America's School Plan as stated above, please forward to me.....copies each week, beginning with the issue dated.....

NAME..... SCHOOL.....

ADDRESS

CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....

1/22

SCHOOL DIRECTORY

SIENA HEIGHTS COLLEGE

ADRIAN, MICHIGAN

A CATHOLIC COLLEGE FOR WOMEN Fully Accredited. Conducted by Sisters of St. Dominic. Bachelor Degrees in Arts, Science, Philosophy, Music, Home Economics, Commercial Education, Teacher Training, Dramatics, Pre-Legal and Pre-Medical Courses, Two-Year Terminal Courses in Secretarial Work. Exceptional Opportunities in Art.

Beautiful Buildings
Interesting Campus Life
For further information address the Dean

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE

TARRYTOWN-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK

Conducted by the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary. Accredited Liberal Arts. Confers A.B., B.S. degrees. Pre-Medical, Secretarial, Home Economics, Arts, Music, Pedagogy, Journalism, Dramatics. Directed field trips in all departments. Athletics. EXTENSION: 221 East 71st Street, New York, N. Y.; Quebec City, Canada; Paris and Rome. Address Secretary.

Marymount Preparatory Schools: Wilson Park, Tarrytown, N. Y.; Fifth Ave. and 84th St., New York, N. Y. Address Reverend Mother.

COLLEGE OF NEW ROCHELLE

NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.

Conducted by the Ursuline Nuns
Offering A.B. and B.S. Degrees

Accredited by the Association of American Universities

WESTCHESTER COUNTY
16 miles from Grand Central Station, N. Y.

ACADEMY OF MOUNT SAINT VINCENT

TUXEDO PARK, N. Y.
Country School for Girls
Founded in 1847. Chartered by the Regents. Accredited by the Middle States Association. Beautifully located among the Ramapo Hills. College Preparatory and General Courses. Art, Music, Dramatics, Home Economics, Athletics including all sports. Send for illustrated catalog A. Phone Tuxedo 259.

COLLEGE OF MOUNT SAINT VINCENT

Mount Saint Vincent-on-Hudson
New York 63, N. Y.

Conducted by the Sisters of Charity
OFFERS A.B. AND B.S. DEGREES
Liberal Arts, Nursing, Commerce, Education, Pedagogy. Approved by the Association of American Universities. Campus bordering Hudson River.

One-half hour from Grand Central Station, New York City
WRITE FOR BULLETIN A

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Founded in 1841 Conducted by the Jesuits

At Fordham Road, Bronx

New York 58, N. Y.

FORDHAM COLLEGE
Boarding Day School on 70-Acre Campus
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
FORDHAM PREPARATORY SCHOOL

At 302 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y.

SCHOOL OF LAW
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
SCHOOL OF ADULT EDUCATION

At 134 East 39th Street

New York 16, N. Y.

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Four residence Halls for Men: St. John's Hall, Bishop's Hall, St. Robert's Hall, Dealy Hall.

One residence Hall for Religious Women: St. Mary's Hall.

Catalogues for each department sent on request.

MT. ST. MARY-ON-THE-HUDSON

Newburgh, New York

Grades First to Twelfth. College Preparatory and General Courses. Emphasis on Character, Health, Spiritual and Mental Development. State-Chartered. Accredited by Middle States Association. Art - Music Dramatics - Home Economics All Seasonable Sports - Campus Overlooks Hudson

SISTERS OF ST. DOMINIO
Telephone Newburgh 300

COLLEGE OF SAINT TERESA

WINONA, MINNESOTA

For the Higher Education of Catholic Women

Holds membership in the North Central Association of Colleges. Accredited by the Association of American Universities. Registered for Teacher's License by New York Board of Regents. Degree of Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Science in Nursing. A Conservatory of Music is maintained in connection with the College. Picturesquely located on the upper Mississippi. One hundred acre campus. Served by the "Zephyr." "Hiawatha," the "400." ONLY FIVE HOURS FROM CHICAGO.

Address the Secretary

GOOD COUNSEL COLLEGE

WHITE PLAINS

Westchester County, New York

Conducted by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion

FULLY ACCREDITED

Standard Courses in Arts and Sciences, pre-medical, journalism, teacher training, secretarial studies, library science, fine arts. Unusually beautiful location. Extensive campus.

FORTY MINUTES FROM NEW YORK

TRINITY COLLEGE

INCORPORATED IN 1879

WASHINGTON, D. C.

An Institution for the Higher Education of Women

Conducted by The Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur. For particulars address the Secretary of the College.

go." Following his sermon, the preacher escaped. His brethren are now waiting to learn where he has prepared a place for them. . . . New methods of snarling traffic were developed. . . . In Anaheim, Calif., as a young man drove a young woman co-worker home from their office, she began to blow bubble gum. A huge bubble popped in the young man's face. While he was engaged in digging the goo out of his eyes, his car swerved into four other cars.

Here, there and everywhere, the note of queerness was apparent. . . . In Tulsa, Okla., while a citizen dined, his eighty-dollar overcoat disappeared. . . . One week later, the citizen, after finishing a meal in the same restaurant, reached for the new overcoat he had bought. Hanging on the peg next to the new overcoat was the missing overcoat. . . . Thirst for knowledge continued. From an R.F.D. address in Texas to a safe manufacturer in New York sped a letter asking for the free booklet, *What You Should Know About Safes*. Because of the puzzling address, the firm instructed its Southwest representative to call on the inquiring prospect. In a few days, the representative reported: "The prospect is serving a life term in prison for repeated burglaries. I did not leave the booklet, *What You Should Know About Safes*."

Not everything during the week was unexpected. . . . Quite expected were the communist jeers following the Papal excommunication of all those involved in the imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. . . . The jeers of the Communists recall the sneers of Napoleon. . . . "What does the Pope mean," asked Napoleon of Eugene in 1807, "by the threat of excommunicating me? Does he think the world has gone back a thousand years? Does he suppose the arms will fall from the hands of my soldiers?" . . . Two years later, the Pope did excommunicate Napoleon. . . . Four years after that, the arms literally fell from the hands of Napoleon's soldiers. . . . And his supposedly invincible legions were converted into miserable stragglers by the blasts of winter. . . . In the Russian retreat, the freezing soldiers found the weapons an insupportable weight. . . . During their frequent falls, the arms fell from their hands, and they let them lie in the snow. . . . The soldiers did not throw their arms away. . . . The arms fell from their hands. . . . The same Eternal Power who stood behind the Pius who excommunicated Napoleon stands behind the Pius who excommunicated the Hungarian stooges of Stalin who have aided in the persecution of the outstanding defender of their own rights—if they but knew it.

JOHN A. TOOMEY

Correspondence

Social security taxes

EDITOR: A letter in your columns from Louis F. Buckley in opposition to the proposal by Walter A. Lynch ("A Step Forward in Social Security," AM. 12/11/48) to achieve coverage of employees of non-profit organizations under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance program by a system of voluntary election, contains a number of unsound statements which ought not to remain unchallenged.

The assertion that "most students of social insurance" favor a system of compulsory coverage is on its face an unwarranted conclusion as to the views of an anonymous majority, unsupported by any responsible survey of opinion. In this connection it should not be overlooked that H.R. 6777 of the 80th Congress, which made provision for voluntary coverage, was favorably voted on by the House of Representatives by the convincing majority of over two-thirds.

Concededly, under a system of voluntary coverage there can be no guarantee that the benefits of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance will be extended to employees of all non-profit organizations. However, the question which the writer does not consider is whether, under the circumstances, the step necessary to provide such a guarantee, i.e., compulsory coverage, is in the interests of the general welfare. That non-profit organizations are anxious to participate in the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance program is beyond dispute. As was pointed out in the majority report of the Advisory Council on Social Security:

Employers in the non-profit field are at a considerable disadvantage in the labor market because they cannot offer retirement and survivorship protection, hence, coverage exclusion handicaps these organizations and fails to promote their services to the community.

Since non-profit organizations are among the foremost exponents of the extension of coverage, and the vast majority of them are not only anxious, but find it essential, to participate in the program, the only practical effect of compulsory coverage is that it would force a small minority of non-profit organizations to provide coverage for their employees. As against this minor benefit is to be weighed the advisability of preserving inviolate the traditional tax-exempt status of non-profit organizations.

The apprehension that the adoption of a compulsory coverage system would tend to lower the barriers against further exactions from non-profit organizations is no idle fear. Indeed, in arguing to the contrary, the writer cites other instances in which involuntary levies have been imposed on such organizations in the past, proof of the fact that each new exaction from such organizations will later be used as a precedent for further "whittling away" of their traditional tax exemption. The fact that repeated infringements on the tax-exempt status of such organizations have not yet led to general taxation of their property and income is no guarantee that, if allowed to continue, they will not eventually bring about that result. Certainly, the trend is in that direction, and in the considered opinion of many thinking people now is the time to arrest it. Loss of tax exemption means the extinction of many non-profit organizations and a drastic curtailment in the functions of others—a price which America should not be willing to pay merely to guarantee coverage to the employees of a small minority of such organizations.

That social-security taxes are "special purpose" taxes dedicated to a particular use will give non-profit organizations little reason for comfort if the taxes are imposed upon them as involuntary exactions. In the first place, another precedent will have been established for invading their traditional tax exemption. In the second place, it will form an ideal pattern for levying further taxes upon those organizations in the future by the use of the same approach. The potential liabilities in "special purpose" taxes alone are almost limitless.

It is not at all clear how provision for the payment of such taxes directly into the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance fund, or a mere statement of policy in the legislation, would serve to "allay the fears" that compulsory coverage would endanger the traditional tax-exempt status of non-profit organizations. Once social-security taxes have been levied involuntarily, as exactions, the mechanics of collection and administration are immaterial. The tax-exempt status of the organizations will have been breached and a precedent for further inroads established. So, too, with a declaration of congressional policy as to the traditional tax-exempt status of non-profit organizations in legislation which, in fact, imposed a

system of compulsory taxation. With complete consistency, future legislation could, by carving out additional exceptions, impose further taxes while at the same time reaffirming the traditional tax-exempt status of non-profit organizations in other fields.

To provide coverage on the one hand, and preservation of tax-exempt status on the other, voluntary election appears to be the only solution.

THOMAS H. MCMANUS

New York, N. Y.

Praising with faint slams

EDITOR: "All the Parades" in your January 1 issue is quite edifying, but just slightly off the beam in several of its details.

The day is "All Souls' Day," not "All Soul's Day." It is *not* a holy day of obligation, either by Church legislation in the United States or by the universal legislation of the Code. And if it were a holy day, it would be precisely that, not a "holyday." We have *holidays* (one word) and *holy days* (two words). If the day *was* All Souls' Day, there would have been not two but three Masses, since every priest has the privilege of saying three Masses on that day.

No pastor in all creation would schedule a special collection for the starving children of Europe on All Souls' Day. That day by immemorial custom has its own special collection, given on the occasion of special suffrage for the Poor Souls.

And *ten dollars* for the starving children of Europe? Really, Mr. Eisele!

But apart from all this—a nice and well-intentioned little article.

(REV.) EDWARD S. SCHWEGLER

Grand Island, N. Y.

Power of prayer

EDITOR: For the first time in my life, I am "writing to the editor." I feel that it is a definite obligation for me to thank you and praise you for publishing E. Boyd Barrett's soul-stirring article and the heartwarming letters that resulted therefrom.

How gratified you must be to have drawn aside the veils that hid the prayerful pleas and secret supplications of those nuns. Those letters seemed to me to be the type of revelation that is reserved for Heaven.

The prayers of nuns defy description. A Carmelite I know has dedicated her religious life to God for His Church and His priests. A good sister of my acquaintance for years prayed daily for the conversion of John Barrymore. Truly, "more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of."

E. M. N.

(Address Withheld)

.....THESE BOOKS BELONG IN YOUR HOME

LOOK THEM OVER

They are the January selections of

The Catholic Children's Book Club

Picture Book Group P

HUSTLE AND BUSTLE

By Louis Slobodkin

An amusing story of two lumbering hippopotamuses, pride of the city zoo, who quarrel, to the distress of young admirers, zoo keepers and city officials.

MACMILLAN — \$1.50

The Train That Saved The Day

By Charlotte Steiner

A tale of the little freight train that saves the day when a shiny new excursion train with its load of picnickers breaks down.

GROSSET — \$.50

Intermediate Group A

PEDRO'S CHOICE

By Catherine Blanton

A young boy encouraged by his friend the Padre in his talent for drawing, nourishes ambitions to be a matador. But after acquiring a young bull, he sells it to aid the ailing Padre, saves it from the bull ring, and decides against a matador's career. He prefers to farm in his native village and continue his drawing.

WHITTLESEY — \$2.00

Older Boys Group B

EMERGENCY RUN

By Edward B. Hungerford

Young New Englander Chad Harper arrives in California at the start of the Spanish-American War. He ships out on the Oregon, just as that battleship starts its historic trip around the Horn to join the Atlantic fleet. Details of the trip, the sinking of the Maine and fighting in Cuba are vividly related against an authentic background.

WILCOX & FOLLETT — \$2.50

Older Girls Group C

GREAT VENTURE

By T. Morris Longstreth

An entertaining, and at times amusing, story of eight years in the life of Daniel Chester French, sculptor of the famous Concord Minute Man. The young artist's aspirations take shape shortly after his seventeenth birthday. We see how he prepares himself and makes a success of his first major assignment.

MACMILLAN — \$2.50

THE CATHOLIC CHILDREN'S BOOK CLUB 70 East 45th Street, New York 17

Please enter this child in the Catholic Children's Book Club. I agree to purchase four books a year.

GROUPS
P. Boys and Girls, 8 to 8
A. Boys and Girls, 9 to 11
B. Boys, 12 to 16
C. Girls, 12 to 16

Child's Name

Address

City Zone..... State.....

Enter in Group ☐ P ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C

Sign Gift Card.....

Adult Donor

Address

City Zone..... State.....

EVERY MONTH

The Catholic Children's Book Club mails each child an exciting new age-graded volume like those reviewed above. As soon as he is enrolled, each child also receives a brightly colored, frameable Membership certificate, bearing your name as donor.

SAVES YOU MONEY

For books retailing at from \$2 to \$3 we bill you at only \$1.90 per month, after acceptance of the book. You make at least four purchases a year. We send you, every month, a Newsletter describing the selections and with other Book Club news.

THE CATHOLIC CHILDREN'S BOOK CLUB

OME

ub

n Cali-
war. He
starts its
ic fleet.
fighting
c back-

f eight
ptor of
artist's
n birth-
success

TH

Book
excit-
ne like
soon
d also
lored,
ertifi-
ne as

NEY

from
only
r ac-
You
hasen
every
scrib-
with

JB